

To the Center of Hellenic Studies



Apollonius of Tyana?

PROBLEMI E RICERCHE DI STORIA ANTICA

10

MARIA DZIELSKA

APOLLONIUS OF TYANA
IN LEGEND AND HISTORY

Translated by Piotr Pieńkowski

“L’ERMA” di BRETSCHNEIDER

Opera pubblicata con il contributo
del Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche

ISBN 88-7062-599-0

©COPYRIGHT 1986 « L'ERMA » di BRETSCHNEIDER
Roma - Via Cassiodoro, 19

CONTENTS

	Page
Select Bibliographical Abbreviations	7
Introduction	9
CHAPTER I	
On the Memoirs of «Damis»	19
CHAPTER II	
Apollonius' and his Cities	51
CHAPTER III	
Tradition on Apollonius' Magic	85
CHAPTER IV	
Apollonius' Philosophy	129
CHAPTER V	
Apollonius' Legend from Hierocles to Nicomachus Flavianus	153
Conclusions	185
Appendix - Modern polemics over Apollonius of Tyana	193
Selected Bibliography	213
Index of classical names	225

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ABBREVIATIONS

ANRW	Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt, Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der Neureren Forschung, Berlin-New York 1972 and ff.
Bonn.	Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae
CAH	Cambridge Ancient History
CH	Contra Hieroclem (in) Vita Apollonii Tyanei (ed. F.C. Conybeare).
CIL	Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum
Epp. Apoll.	Epistolae Apollonii Tyanei (ed. R.J. Penella)
ILS	Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae (ed. H. Dessau)
HA	Scriptores Historiae Augustae
MGHAA	Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi
PG	Patrologia Graeca (ed. J.P. Migne)
PIR ²	Prosopographia Imperii Romani (ed. A. Groag, A. Stein et alii)
PL	Patrologia Latina (ed. J.P. Migne)
PLRE	The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire (ed. A.H.M. Jones, J.R. Martindale, J. Morris)
RAC	Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum (ed. H. Klauser)
RE	Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft
REG	Revue des Études Grecques
VA	Vita Apollonii Tyanei (ed. F.C. Conybeare)
VS	Vitae Sophistarum (ed. W.C. Wright)

INTRODUCTION

A historian assuming that Apollonius of Tyana existed solely as a hero of an extensive legend which has persisted till this day, would not stray far from the truth. This is because Apollonius, as a historical figure, is shrouded in the obscurity of history.

Historical sources contemporary with Apollonius, who lived in the first and at the beginning of the second centuries, keep silent about him. Historians and philosophers of those times did not even mention his name. Only several dozen years after his death, in the age of the Antonines, did there begin to appear some pieces of information about the first biographies of Apollonius, some opinions on him, and some letters signed with his name. The first biography of Apollonius written by Philostratus of Lemnos ¹ and fully preserved till our times, dates back to the third century, that is to the reign of the Severi. The silence kept by the writers contemporary to Apollonius and the poor condition of the sources from the second century which supply information on him, make all attempts to reveal the true Apollonius well-nigh impossible.

Yet these difficulties have never made scholars abandon their hopes to solve the riddle of the sage of Tyana. As we know, studies of Apollonius have a long tradition. The studies undertaken by Eduard Meyer and Ewen Lyall Bowie provide the framework for the course of serious research

¹ On Philostratus see G.W. BOWERSOCK, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire*, Oxford 1969, pp. 1-16; B.P. REARDON, *Courants Littéraires Grecs des II^e et III^e Siècles après J.-C.* (Annales Littéraires de l'Université de Nantes, fasc. 3), Paris 1971, pp. 185-98 and passim.

on the truth and fiction in the work of Philostratus, on pre-Philostratean accounts of Apollonius, and on the origin of the writings connected with his name. In 1917 Meyer published his fundamental work *Apollonius von Tyana und die Biographie des Philostratus*². In 1978 it was thoroughly revised by Bowie in his brilliant treatise *Apollonius of Tyana: Tradition and Reality*³, where, at the same time, he paid homage to Meyer's achievements. At present, this is the last word on the pre-Philostratean Apollonius and on the role of Philostratus in the shaping of his legendary picture.

Recently we have witnessed some revival of interest in the figure of Apollonius. Suffice it to mention here two new editions of VA: the English one by C.P. Jones⁴ and the Italian by D. Del Corno⁵, as well as a long awaited, excellent edition of the letters of Apollonius by R.J. Penella⁶. Penella is also the author of numerous and valuable works both on Apollonius and on the VA of Philostratus. Moreover, the study of the Arabic tradition of Apollonius have made considerable progress. In 1980 U. Weisser edited *Das Buch über das Geheimnis der Schöpfung*⁷ - an Arabic pseudoepigraph attributed to Apollonius of Tyana in the Arabic occultist literature.

In recent times, a wide debate has been provoked over an inscription with an epigram glorifying Apollonius which

² Hermes 52, 1917, pp. 371-424.

³ ANRW, Teil II: *Principat*, Bd. 16, 2, 1978, pp. 1652-99.

⁴ Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius*, ed. abr. and introd. by G.W. Bowersock, Harmondsworth 1970.

⁵ Filostrato, *Vita di Apollonio di Tiana*, Milano 1978; I should also mention the latest edition of VA in Spanish translated by A.B. Pajares (*Vida de Apolonio de Tiana*, Madrid 1979).

⁶ The Letters of Apollonius of Tyana, a critical Text with Prolegomena, Translation and Commentary, Mnemosyne Supplementum 56, Leiden 1979.

⁷ *Das Buch über das Geheimnis der Schöpfung von Pseudo-Apollonius von Tyana* (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Quellkunde der alten Medizin, III abt. Bd. 2, Arabische Medizin), Berlin-New York 1980.

was found among the exhibits of the Adana Museum. The debate was initiated almost simultaneously in 1978 by G. Dagon, J. Marcillet-Jaubert⁸, and Bowie⁹, then continued by J. and L. Robert¹⁰, and Jones¹¹. In 1981 they were joined by other scholars. Now the last word in this matter belongs to W. Peek¹².

Recent works on Dio Chrysostom provide a considerable help in the attempts to establish the model Philostratus had in mind when shaping the figure of his hero in VA. Here I mean the books by P. Desideri¹³, Jones¹⁴, and an innovative treatise by J. Moles¹⁵, all of them dealing with the problems of Dio Chrysostom's career and philosophical conversion. It is in this context that the question of the relationship between Dio Chrysostom and Apollonius, extensively discussed in VA by Philostratus, is being considered.

It should be self-evident that in the absence of proper sources the studies on Apollonius have always been interlinked with the analysis of Philostratus' VA. The latter has been dealt with from various angles, and the Philostratean studies constitute a separate branch in the research on culture of the Early Roman Empire. The present work, devoted to Apollonius, does not aim at enumerating all the trends in the studies of VA. I would only like to add that the

⁸ *Inscriptions de Cilicie et d'Isaurie*, Türk Tarih Kurumu Belleten 42, 1978, pp. 402-5 and pl. 6.

⁹ Op. cit., pp. 1687-88.

¹⁰ Bulletin Épigraphique, Revue des Études grecques XCII, 1979, No 592.

¹¹ *An Epigram on Apollonius of Tyana*, Journal of Hellenic Studies 100, 1980, pp. 190-94 and pl. lb.

¹² *Epigramm auf Apollonius von Tyana*, Philologus 2, Bd. 125, 1981, pp. 297-98.

¹³ *Dione di Prusa, Un Intellettuale greco nell'Impero Romano*, (Biblioteca di Cultura Contemporanea CXXXV), Messina-Firenze 1978.

¹⁴ *The Roman World of Dio Chrysostom*, Cambridge Mass., London 1978.

¹⁵ *The Career and Conversion of Dio Chrysostom*, Journal of Hell. Stud. 98, 1978, pp. 79-100.

publication of *Die griechisch-römische Biographie* by F. Leo¹⁶ initiated discussion about the literary form of VA. Scholars keep wondering at the true character of this work: what sort of biography it is (Leo), whether it is a Heliodoran romance¹⁷, romantic hagiography¹⁸, or whether, according to J. Palm's recent suggestion¹⁹, it is a documentary romance.

From among the works concerning the study of VA as a source of the history of the Early Empire, *La Vita di Apollonio di Tiana come fonte storica* by F. Grosso²⁰ is quoted most frequently. Grosso not only tries to represent the advantages of VA as a historical source, but also to prove that the Philostratean picture of Apollonius conforms to reality. Grosso believes in Philostratus' assertion that in the description of his hero he utilized the memoirs of Damis who, according to him, had been one of the most faithful pupils of Apollonius. Furthermore, Grosso assumes that Damis did exist in reality and compiled his notebooks during the reign of Nerva. As we know, Philostratus refers to Damis when he describes the whole series of events which took place in the first century and in which Apollonius was an active participant. The events among which he places Apollonius are widely known from the works of Roman

¹⁶ Leipzig 1901, pp. 261-62.

¹⁷ E. ROHDE, *Der Griechische Roman und Seine Vorläufer*, Leipzig 1914, p. 476 ff.

¹⁸ L. LO CASCIO, *La Forma letteraria della Vita di Apollonio Tiano*, Quaderni dell'Istituto di Filologia Greca dell'Università di Palermo 6, 1974, pp. 82-96.

¹⁹ *Om Filostratos och Hans Apollonios-Biografi*, Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis (Studia Graeca Upsaliensia 10), Uppsala 1976, p. 38 ff., and my review of this work (in) *Eos* LXVI, 1978, pp. 331-33. Recently, the links between VA and the Greek romance from the times of the Empire were noticed by D. DEL CORNO in his work *Lo Scritto di Filostrato su Apollonio Tiano e la Tradizione della narrativa* (in) *La struttura della Fabulazione antica*, (Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto di Filologia classica e medievale 54), Genova 1979, pp. 65-87.

²⁰ *Acme* 7, 1954, pp. 333-352; scholars' views on Grosso's work are presented by Bowie, op. cit., p. 1654 note 7.

historians. Only occasionally does Philostratus enrich them with interesting details. Yet Bowie²¹ is right to suggest that the conformability of historical accounts contained in VA to historical events of the first century does not prove in itself the historicity of the events of Apollonius' life as outlined in VA. That is why Grosso's work should be treated most cautiously. It is sufficient to refer to Bowersock's short introduction to Jones's translation of VA to find a more reliable criticism of historical facts contained in VA than that supplied in Grosso's comprehensive treatise.

What appears to be an important trend in the studies of VA is the analysis of its relationship with the literature of the nineteenth century in F. Baur's work *Apollonius von Tyana und Christus oder das Verhältnis des Pythagoreismus zum Christentum*²². After the Second World War Baur's analysis has been resumed by some German scholars who carried out their research according to the *Formgeschichtliche Forschung* methods. Among them we should mention here three authors: H.J. Schütz²³, G. Petzke²⁴, and D. Esser²⁵, whose findings allowed to place VA in the context of the Hellenic aretologic tradition. Studies of the multistructural work of Philostratus are under way²⁶.

Philostratus' biographic work is most hampering for a

²¹ Op. cit., pp. 1654-55.

²² (in) *Drei Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der alten Philosophie und ihres Verhältnisses zum Christentum*, ed. E. Zeller, Leipzig 1876, pp. 1-227.

²³ *Beiträge zur Formgeschichte synoptischer Wundererzählungen, dargestellt an der Vita Apollonii des Philostratus*, Diss, Jena 1953.

²⁴ *Die Traditionen über Apollonius von Tyana und das Neue Testament* (Studia ad Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti Bd. 1), Leiden 1970.

²⁵ *Formgeschichtliche Studien zur hellenistischen und zur frühchristlichen Literatur unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Vita Apollonii des Philostrat und der Evangelien*, Diss. Bonn 1969.

²⁶ See L. BELLONI, *Aspetti dell'antica ΣΟΦΙΑ in Apollonio di Tiana*, *Aevum*, *Rassegna di Scienze storiche, linguistiche e filologiche* 1, LIV, 1980, pp. 140-49.

historian who would like to use it as material for studying the life and views of the historical Apollonius. This is due to the fact that Philostratus, as a man of letters and sophist full of passion for Greek Romance and for the studies in rhetoric, was hardly interested in the historical Apollonius. Besides, he did not have at his disposal much information about the sage of Tyana. Judging by the sources, Apollonius was little known in the Greco-Roman world. His legend arose after his death thanks to his pupils and first biographers; Philostratus, at the behest of Julia Domna Augusta (VA I 3)²⁷, became its subsequent propagator. To satisfy the empress's demand, who asked him to narrate the life and achievements of Apollonius, he had to invent this figure, as it were, anew. Thus, using his literary imagination, he turned a modest Cappadocian mystic into an impressive figure, full of life, politically outstanding, and yet also preposterous. Philostratus formed Apollonius' religious and political beliefs much after the fashion and tendencies prevailing at the court of the Severi to which, as a writer at this court, he was particularly susceptible. This problem was studied by J. Réville²⁸ and A. Calderini²⁹. Moreover, the philhellenism of Philostratus himself found its expression in Apollonius' deep attachment to Greek religion and culture.

In the present work where Apollonius is treated both as a historical figure existing at a definite time and in a

²⁷ On Julia Domna see T. MANTERO, *Ricerche sull'Heroikos di Filostrato* (Publicazioni dell'Istituto di Filologia Classica dell'Università di Genova n. 21), Genova 1966, pp. 25-34; on women of the Severan dynasty: J. BABELON, *Impératrices Syriennes*, Paris 1957; G. TURTON, *The Syrian Princesses: The Women who ruled Rome, A.D. 193-235*, London 1974, and the latest work by E. KETTENHOFEN, *Die syrischen Augustae in der historischen Überlieferung* (*Antiquitas, Reihe 3, ser. in 4to Bd. 24*), Bonn 1979.

²⁸ *La Religion à Rome sous les Sévères*, Paris 1885.

²⁹ *Teoria e pratica nella «Vita di Apollonio di Tiana»*, *Rendiconti dell'Istituto Lombardo, Classe di Lettere, Scienze morali e storiche* 74, 1940-41, pp. 213-41.

definite geographical region, and as a literary hero, it is my duty to refer all the time to the work which called him into being as a literary figure. Yet I would like to make it clear that just as I am not concerned with the literary studies of VA, so too I am not interested in its usefulness as a source for the history of the first century. I regard it solely as material reflecting the life of the real Apollonius. Moreover, I consider this material useful and historically valuable only when it finds its confirmation in other literary and historical sources.

The legend of Apollonius, so enriched by Philostratus, would not have persisted had it not been for Sossianus Hierocles, the governor of Bithynia, the sophist and the persecutor, at Diocletian's side, of Christians. At the beginning of the fourth century he published a treatise against Christianity where he belittled the divine attributes of Christ, and praised Apollonius' virtues and thaumaturgic abilities. It was the VA of Philostratus itself that Hierocles used to propagate his «pagan Christ». This book, hardly popular in the third century except at the court of the Severi, thanks to Hierocles became famous and widely read. In the third century the figure of Apollonius did not raise controversy. He was simply one of the interesting men from the Greek world of religion and philosophy. Yet the moment Hierocles contrasted Apollonius with Christ, there arose a vehement contention over the magician and philosopher of Tyana between pagans and Christians who were enraged at Hierocles' work. The beginning of the fourth century, that is the period of Diocletian's persecution of Christians, was at the same time the starting point for the legend of Apollonius which, without many alterations, has persisted till our times. Without Hierocles, Apollonius would remain for us only a figure from the biographic work of Philostratus, the figure shaped according to the abilities of this moderately gifted writer.

The modern fortunes of Apollonius' legend, which revived again owing to the religious and ideological dispute at the turn of the sixteenth century, I present separately in the Appendix.

From Philostratus onwards, the legend of Apollonius has been constantly interwoven with history; often it even overshadowed the latter. In the present work, I try to separate these two matters as far as it is possible, feeling prompted by the duty of the historian. That is why chapters III and V deal more with the legend, whereas the main issue of chapter I, II, and IV is the historical figure of Apollonius.

The fortunes of Apollonius' legend in the fourth century are contained in a separate chapter V, notwithstanding the fact that the content of this chapter remains in a close relationship with chapter III. Such a division of the subject matter is justified not only because of the importance of the fourth century in the history of the post-Philostratean tradition, but also because Apollonius' legend arose in that century under the influence still of authentic sources concerning Apollonius. In later ages the legend underwent substantial alterations and mythical elaboration.

I would not like to force an open-door again. Therefore I have availed myself of Bowie's findings on the pre-Philostratean tradition of Apollonius, and of Penella's arguments concerning the authenticity of the origin of Apollonius' letters. On this basis I frame my own hypotheses.

The present work includes a selected bibliography although. I have already enumerated the latest studies on Apollonius. The up-to-date bibliography on this subject is contained also in Bowie's treatise and in Weisser's work.

This book came into being thanks to the help of particular people and institutions. The idea was first suggested to me by Professor Alexander Krawczuk, to whom I would like to extend a note of gratitude for his professional super-

vision of my research work, and for his painstaking proof-reading of the first version of the present book.

The publication of this book has been possible thanks to a kind interest in the subject of my work exhibited by Professor Mario A. Levi.

I would like also to thank my colleague and publishing reviewer of this book, Mr Maciej Salamon, for his help and precious counsel.

The material for the present work was collected in the excellent library and among the charming surroundings of the Foundation Hardt in Geneva in 1975 and 1978. The book acquired its final shape during my nine months' stay in the Center for Hellenic Studies in Washington in 1980/81. I would like to acknowledge the enormous debt I owe to the director of the Center, Professor Bernard M.W. Knox, and to the whole staff of the same Institution. A word of thanks is also due to my colleagues from the Center who — during my stay there — constantly encouraged me and helped me with their professional advice.

I am also most grateful for the services rendered by the Jagiellonian Library in Cracow. Especially, I am indebted to Mrs Halina Bednar, the head of its interlibrary lending department.

Finally, I would like to thank all my friends here and abroad who assisted me in numerous ways. From among them I am particularly beholden to Mr and Mrs Nicholas and Eugenie Richardson, for their unique and versatile assistance offered during my writing of the present work.

Kraków, 1982

CHAPTER I

ON THE MEMOIRS OF "DAMIS"

In VA I 3 Philostratus relates that as the main source of his biographic romance he utilized *Hypomnèmata* written by Damis, a devoted pupil of Apollonius. Also he calls them here *Deltoi*, or - jocularly - the *Scrapbook*. Accordingly, Philostratus presents the memoirs of Damis (VA I 19; VII 28) as a collection of various anecdotes and notes which apparently Damis jotted down when he accompanied Apollonius on his numerous journeys, usually full of various paradoxographic events.

Ostensibly, it was the Empress Julia Domna herself who handed those *Deltoi* over to Philostratus (I 3). She had obtained them, claims Philostratus, from a certain relative of Damis. Then the Empress asked Philostratus to give them a final literary form, as they required some editorial emendations.

The Hypomnèmata of Damis have always been a great problem in the studies of Philostratus' work. Scholars have wondered whether the memoirs were only a figment of Philostratus' literary imagination, or whether they constituted a real notebook compiled by a certain pupil of Apollonius. This question has been raised not only by specialists in literature but also by historians. The latest views on the "Damis question" I present below. On their basis I consider Damis a fictitious figure and his memoirs (or notebooks) an invention of Philostratus.

Yet it is mainly because of another reason that I am interested in the memoirs of "Damis" in the present work. They reveal Apollonius to have been a prominent figure

in the Empire of the first century. "Damis" tries to persuade the reader that Apollonius played a significant role at that time: he interfered with imperial affairs, he was a close friend of Vespasian and Titus, he publicly criticized the rule of Nero, and fought against Domitian who even brought him to his tribunal. Apollonius maintained many friendly relations with outstanding intellectuals of the age. Some other aspects of the sage's activities, such as thaumaturgy, healing, prophesying, public teachings, and his Pythagorean way of life also found their place in the subsequent parts of VA, where Philostratus refers to biographic materials independent of "Damis". However, it should be stressed once again that the stories about Apollonius' relationship with the emperors and with other famous figures of the first century Philostratus contained exclusively in the memoirs of "Damis".

Using all his literary means Philostratus tries to assert that everything described by "Damis" is historically valid. As to his other sources, he either criticizes them (I 3), or dismisses them with a brief mention (I 3; 12). It is just this indiscriminate attitude towards "Damis" relation that makes us believe in Philostratus' authorship of the memoirs. That is why we should be particularly cautious in their analysis. Further considerations will prove that this caution is by all means advisable.

Let me summarize now what "Damis" — apparently a witness to Apollonius' political activities and to his relationships — writes.

"Damis" met Apollonius when the latter was setting off to India (I 19). He accompanied Apollonius during his entire stay first in Persia and then in India (VA I 19-40; II and III *passim*). In Persia Apollonius called on King Vardanes, and from there he also corresponded with the sophist Scopelianus (I 23 and 24); in India he sought the Brahmans to benefit from their teachings.

Having returned from India, Apollonius went to Ionia. Tired and weary of the Greeks from Asia Minor (IV 1-11), he set off to Greece proper. Here he visited numerous cities and regions, everywhere propagating his moral teachings and reforming cultes. In Athens he extended his stay (IV 17-22). Besides, he went to Sparta where he contributed to its moral revival (27; 31-33). Next he made his way to Rome which at that time was under the rule of Nero. Near Aricia he met the philosopher Philolaos of Kitton who was trying to deter him from visiting Rome (IV 36). Philolaos told him about the danger which was in store for Apollonius, as just at that time Nero began to persecute philosophers. Despite the warnings Apollonius made for Rome, being accompanied only by eight pupils. Others abandoned him out of fear.

In Rome he was summoned by the consul Telesinus (IV 39). Having found Apollonius a religious person, he encouraged him to reform the temples of Rome, and set him free. Meanwhile, Demetrius the Cynic, a great admirer of the sage, came to the city and made a speech against a new gymnasium built by Nero (IV 42). Tigellinus, Nero's omnipotent prefect of the praetorians, sent Demetrius to exile. Moreover, he began to suspect Apollonius himself. First he spied on the philosopher (IV 43), and finally arrested him (44). Terrified by Apollonius' supernatural power (he made him blind for a while), Tigellinus set him free as he did not want to "fight against a god".

At that time another philosopher, the Stoic Musonius Rufus was serving his sentence in one of Nero's prisons. Apollonius began to send letters to him which were delivered to the prison by his disciples. In this correspondence, Apollonius paid homage to Musonius, by comparing him to Socrates (IV 46). In future he was to meet him once again when the latter was "bearing his irons" in a prison at the Isthmus of Corinth (V 19).

When Nero went to Greece to arrange his artistic performances there (IV 47), Apollonius went to Spain. Here he met a governor of Baetica with whom he discussed Vindex's conspiracy which Apollonius secretly supported (V 10). He also foretold the quick fall of Galba, Otho, and Vitellius (V 11).

Having returned to Athens via Sicily, Apollonius went to Rhodes (V 21), and from there to Alexandria (V 24). Alexandria was preparing itself for the arrival of Vespasian. According to Philostratus, at that time the emperor was coming to seek confirmation of his monarchical power there (V 27). Soon after his arrival Vespasian expressed his wish to meet Apollonius. Yet the latter had been already waiting for him at the gate to the temple. At Vespasian's request: *ποιήσον με βασιλέα* Apollonius presented his views on the monarchical regime. As the result of this conversation, Vespasian asked him, Dio Chrysostom, and Euphrates, to discuss together the best form of political system. All the three philosophers revealed their views and political convictions to the emperor (V 32-36). Vespasian accorded with Apollonius' pieces of advice and instructions. Later several times he talked with him about justice and the ethical duties of the ruler (V 28). On leaving Alexandria, Vespasian invited Apollonius to follow him to Rome. Yet the philosopher did not seize the opportunity, alleging the necessity of a visit to the Gymnosophists in Ethiopia (37).

In Ethiopia Apollonius learnt about Titus' seizure of Jerusalem. He sent a letter praising Titus' humane feelings and moderation. In reply, Titus invited Apollonius to Antioch (VI 30). Here the emperor asked the philosopher to teach him how to wield power, as he had just been chosen by his father as a co-regent in the principate. Apollonius recommended Titus Demetrius the Cynic as his adviser (VI 31). He also foretold the way he was to die (VI 32).

After Titus' short reign power was seized by Domitian.

This bad and distrustful ruler learnt about Apollonius' success in many cities of Asia Minor. Euphrates, who hated Apollonius, informed the emperor about the anti-state content of the philosopher's speeches delivered in the Ionian cities. The emperor knew that Apollonius was on friendly terms with the opponents of his regime: Marcus Cocceius Nerva, Salvidienus Orphitus, and Verginius Rufus (VII 8). That is why he ordered the governor of Asia to arrest Apollonius and to take him to Rome. Yet Apollonius chose to go to Rome of his own free will (VII 10).

The subsequent journey of Apollonius to Rome resembles very much the one he had undertaken in Nero's time. In Dicaearchia Apollonius met Demetrius who tried to dissuade him from going further (VII 14). However, Apollonius rejected all his warnings. Having arrived at Rome, he was arrested by Casperius Aelianus, the prefect of the praetorians, who had known Apollonius in Egypt, and felt attracted to him (VII 17-20). While in prison, Apollonius discussed with his fellow-prisoners the problem of evil in the shape of the tyranny. After preliminary interrogations, Domitian ordered that Apollonius should have his hair and beard shaved off and that he should be thrown into a dungeon. A few days later he summoned him again, only to put him on a formal trial, accusing him of odd habits, such as his strange way of dressing, of his claims to be god, of his conjuring tricks performed in Ephesus, and of his support given to the anti-State activities of Nerva and his companions, by means of magic. However, Apollonius held his own and delivered such a convincing apology that the tyrant cleared him of any accusations and, what was more, asked Apollonius for a private conversation. At this moment the philosopher disappeared and moved, also by supernatural means, to Dicaearchia in southern Italy. From there he set off to Greece and then to Ionia, where he stayed

for two years. In Ephesus he experienced the death of Domitian, witnessing telepathically the attempt on his life.

When Nerva ascended the throne, he invited Apollonius to Rome as he wanted the philosopher to become his adviser. Apollonius declined Nerva's request feeling the burden of his age. Yet he sent "Damis" with a letter to Nerva, in which he shared with the emperor his political experience (VIII 28).

Here the story narrated by "Damis" comes to its end (VIII 29). He passes over both the birth and the death of Apollonius in silence. Information about these facts and about Apollonius' early youth Philostratus derived from other sources.

While reading this fable about the magician and the Roman emperors told by an "eye-witness", it is hard to believe that a scholar as prominent as Fulvio Grosso took it seriously. As I have already mentioned in the Introduction, he not only considered it as a document of first century history (which roughly can be acknowledged), but also tried to persuade the reader that it is based on real facts from Apollonius' life ¹. Why not then acknowledge the historicity of, let us say, a romance story about King Artaxerxes' trial of Chaereas contained in Chariton's *Story of Chaereas and Callirhoe*, or Iamblichus' story about a bad king Garmos who persecuted the hero and heroine of Iamblichus' *Babyloniaca* ²?

The historical adventures presented by "Damis" are different from those described by Iamblichus in the *Babyloniaca* only in so far as they are a falsification compiled with a chronicler's precision. Despite the fact that the events which appear in the story have the same simple skeleton, they

¹ La "Vita di Apollonio di Tiana", op. cit., passim.

² T. SINKO, *Literatura grecka*, Vol. III, part 1, Kraków 1951, pp. 473 and 481-82.

are chronologically coherent, historically ordered, and the facts and figures mentioned there can be determined³. It would be enough to take the works of Roman historians. Yet which of those works presents Apollonius of Tyana as a historical figure of great importance who carried out his mission as a political adviser and moralizer?

It was already Meyer who engaged himself in a severe and manifold criticism of "Damis" memoirs, holding that they are the expression of Philostratus' imagination. He also thought that Philostratus had not expected the reader to believe in "Damis" narrative⁴. Philostratus assumed that the reader would understand his literary device. Moreover, the scholars before Meyer also doubted the authenticity of those memoirs⁵.

I have mentioned in the Introduction that Grosso's treatise finds a cold reception in contemporary studies, and that sometimes it is strongly criticized⁶. It is only Lo Cascio who accepts Grosso's findings without qualifications⁷. Likewise, E. Cizek in his study on Nero's reign utilizes Philostratus' materials without bothering about their historical value⁸.

Scholars who study the links between Greek and early Christian literature place the memoirs of "Damis" in the aretological tradition⁹. Petzke, one of their representatives,

³ Sometimes VA gives us interesting pieces of information on the history of the Greek East in the early Empire (Cf. e. g. C. G. CHARLES-PICARD, J. ROUGÉ, *Textes et Documents relatifs à la Vie économique et sociale dans l'Empire romain, 31 avant J.-C.-225 après J.-C.* (Regards sur l'Histoire I - Sciences auxiliaires de l'Histoire), Paris 1969, pp. 135-36; 178-79).

⁴ *Apollonius von Tyana*, op. cit., pp. 371-82 and 421 f.

⁵ Among others K.I. MILLER, *Die Damispapiere in Philostratus Apolloniosbiographie*, *Philologus* 66, 1907, pp. 511-25; those views are collected by Grosso, op. cit., pp. 345-54.

⁶ Cf. Bowie, op. cit., p. 1654.

⁷ *La Forma letteraria della Vita di Apollonio Tianeio*, op. cit., pp. 32-34; 45.

⁸ *L'Époque de Néron et ses Controverses idéologiques*, Leiden 1972, p. 245.

⁹ M. HADAS, M. SMITH, *Heroes and Gods, Spiritual Biographies in Antiquity*.

assumes that the "Damis" myth existed already in pre-Philostratean times¹⁰. In that way Petzke resumes the studies once initiated by R. Reitzenstein¹¹.

It was only B.L. Taggart who framed an interesting hypothesis in a similar strain on the "Damis" question¹². He pointed out that "Damis" might have been Philostratus' literary invention in the same way as Dictys Cretensis or Dares the Phrygian were the names assumed by the authors compiling diaries on the Trojan War. He also suggested that "Damis" *Hypomnēmata* could have been written by certain Pythagoreans in order to commemorate the master who propagated their philosophy. Thus they intended to hand down his wisdom, which otherwise might have been forgotten, to later generations.

However, those are only interesting surmises. A factual criticism of "Damis" accounts was carried out only by Bowersock and Bowie.

On the basis of some characteristic examples from VA, Bowersock¹³ proves that "Damis" notes can be by no means treated as a reliable historical source. Bowersock considers preposterous the facts concerning the Cynic Demetrius and the dates of his anti-Neronian plotting. He holds a similar view on the date of Windex's rebellion in which, according to Philostratus, Apollonius was involved.

ty, London 1965, pp. 61-66; M. SMITH, *Prolegomena to a Discussion of Aretologies, Divine Man, the Gospel and Jesus*, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 92, 1973, pp. 405-16; H. TALBERT, *Biographies of Philosophers and Rulers in Mediterranean Antiquity*, ANRW Teil II: *Principat*, Bd. 16, Teil bd. 2, Berlin-New York 1978, p. 1620 ff.

¹⁰ *Die Traditionen über Apollonius von Tyana*, op. cit., pp. 67-72.

¹¹ *Hellenistische Wundererählungen*, Leipzig 1908, p. 40 n. A similar view is expressed now by Penella (in) *Scopelianus and the Eretrians in Cissia*, *Athenaeum* 52, 1974, p. 295.

¹² *Apollonius of Tyana, His Biographers and Critics*, Diss. Tufts University 1972, pp. University 1972, pp. 71-72; 74-77.

¹³ (In) Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius*, op. cit., pp. 10 and 17-19.

Although Bowersock notices a certain concurrence of names, facts, and plots contained in "Damis" with those of the first century, he argues that they are too slight to prove Apollonius' participation in these events.

The inconsistency of "Damis" accounts with the data taken from historical sources (Tacitus, Josephus Flavius, Suetonius, Cassius Dio) is extensively dealt with by Bowie. He approaches "Damis" memoirs from the same side as Grosso did, and yet in the end he arrives at utterly different conclusions. Grosso, trying to make VA historically true, stretches the sources and misinterprets their content. Bowie simply reads Roman historians and on this basis he revises the legend created by Philostratus. He discredits the date of Apollonius' visit to the Parthian king Vardanes (VA I 28; III 58), he points out Philostratus' historical inaccuracies concerning Apollonius' activities in Nero's time, and finds much falsity contained in the stories about Apollonius' philosophical friendships with Musonius Rufus and Demetrius. Furthermore, Bowie sets the description of Vespasian's stay in Alexandria in a proper perspective¹⁴.

Bowie also considers the problem of the origin of the "Damis" memoirs. Here he bases his analysis on the views of W. Speyer¹⁵ who, in turn, advocates views once expressed by Taggart. He holds that the memoirs of "Damis" were invented by certain Pythagoreans who might have been inspired by Dictys's diary. Allegedly, it was also they who finally presented Julia Domna with this falsification. Conversely, Bowie assumes that the real and only author of this fake was Philostratus himself who could of course have known Dictys's diary and could have referred to him as to a literary model. According to Bowie, Philostratus con-

¹⁴ Op. cit., pp. 1653-71.

¹⁵ *Zum Bild des Apollonius von Tyana bei Heiden und Christen*, Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum 17, 1974, pp. 49-50.

trived *Hypomnēmata* of “Damis” in order to give his work a narrative shape and an interesting setting. Taking into consideration numerous examples from the Greek romance, Bowie shows how Philostratus utilized some of their motifs when shaping “Damis” story. Then Bowie reveals the second source of Philostratus’ inspiration: lives of well-known sophists, to which Philostratus had already devoted much thought while writing VA. *Lives of the Sophists* was his next publication after VA.

Bowie suggests that primarily Philostratus was more interested in composing a well-structured romance than a historical biography or a propagandistic work which would promulgate Pythagoreanism. That is why he presented the Pythagorean philosophy of his hero almost solely as magic, and based his life on the patterns taken from Greek Romance, and from the lives of famous sophists of the second century.

In my opinion Bowie frames a very interesting hypothesis as regards the name of Damis. He assumes that it could have been derived from the name of Flavius Damianus, a well-known sophist of Ephesus of the second century. To all appearances, Flavius Damianus was Philostratus’ preceptor, a friend to the court of the Severi, and a protector of sophists¹⁶. Damianus might have given Philostratus some information on Apollonius. Bowie’s hypothesis on the name of Damis agrees with his conviction that the historical Apollonius has strong connections with Ephesus¹⁷.

Besides VA, none of the historical sources mentions “Damis” as the author of the memoirs on Apollonius. In *Contra Hieroclem* (II) Eusebius of Caesarea quotes Hierocles’

¹⁶ Op. cit., p. 1670; other views on Damis’ name see Lévy, *Recherches sur les Sources de la Légende de Pythagore*, (Bibliothèque de l’École des hautes Études Sciences religieuses 42), Paris 1926, p. 135 nn; earlier Meyer, op cit., pp. 135-36.

¹⁷ Op. Cit., pp. 1670; 1681; 1687; on Damianus see Bowersock, *Greek Sophists*, op. cit., pp. 4; 18; 27-28 and ff.

words which suggest that the latter appreciated Damis as Apollonius' biographer, and he even called him a "philosopher". Unfortunately, Hierocles' work cannot be accepted as an independent historical document. Hierocles repeated Philostratus' views blindly, and accepted indiscriminately all his inventions. He used biographic work of Philostratus as anti-Christian propaganda, being hardly interested in its historical validity.

For the second time the name of Damis appears in a more interesting context: in a certain Sanskrit text which contains some other names from VA: Apollonius, Damis, Iarchas, and Phraotes¹⁸. A historian who knows the post-Philostratean tradition of Apollonius can easily notice that it also cannot be reckoned as a source independent of VA. We are fully entitled to assume that beginning with late antiquity, Philostratus' work was known in Syria, Persia, and through them probably in India, too¹⁹.

Bowersock, and especially Bowie, demonstrated to what extent Philostratus was unconcerned with history in his work. However, their proper scepticism should not, in my opinion, prevent us completely from considering Philostratus' work as a source for the life of the Cappadocian magician and philosopher who is here the object of our interest.

Yet the utilization of this source requires a thorough and conscientious analysis of what is the product of Philostratus' imagination and what of his knowledge, in the light of the information which can be derived from more reliable sources. Only in this way can we ascertain whether Apollonius knew any of the Roman emperors, and whether

¹⁸ V. BATHACHARYA, *The Āgamaśāstra of Gaudapāda*, Calcutta 1943, pp. LXXII-LXXIV. I have not seen this text. I know about its existence thanks to the information kindly given to me by Professor G.W. Bowersock.

¹⁹ J. RUSKA, *Tabula Smaragdina, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der hermetischen Literatur* (= *Heidelberg Akten der von-Portheim-Stiftung Bd.16*), Heidelberg 1926, pp. 164-73.

he maintained personal contacts with the leading figures of his time.

The first Roman historian who supplies some pieces of information on Apollonius is Cassius Dio. This fact is worth stressing. The historical validity of Dio's work cannot be questioned. He reports an unusual event which happened in Ephesus in 96 A.D. There, the visionary Apollonius of Tyana witnessed the assassination of Domitian which took place in Rome²⁰. There were three freedmen who participated in the murder: Stephanus, Parthenius, and Maximus. Apollonius accompanied them in their action by means of his telepathic powers. He mounted a lofty rock and cried to encourage Stephanus in his attack against the emperor: καλῶς Στέφανε, εὖ γε Στέφανε, παῖε τὸν μαιφόνον. Dio points out that he is not certain whether the event actually took place in Ephesus. It could have happened somewhere else: ἢ καὶ ἐτέρῳθι.

Philostratus, however, has no doubts. The event took place in Ephesus when Apollonius was preaching to the Ephesians. Suddenly he interrupted, shouting loudly: παῖε τὸν τύραννον, παῖε. Then he explained to his dumbfounded listeners that thanks to the gods and to his own πρόγνωσις he suddenly saw the death of the tyrant (VIII 26).

Both versions differ in details. In VA Apollonius is a sophist who addresses the crowd, whereas in Dio's work he is merely a "certain" Apollonius. Ἀπολλώνιος τις Τυανεύς, who attracted attention in the city because of his cry. Dio is not sure where this event really occurred. Yet later sources corroborate his assumption. Zonaras²¹, Cassius Dio's epitomizer and a historian from the twelfth century, does not have any doubts that it was Ephesus

²⁰ Dio Cass. LXVII 18,4.

²¹ *Epitome Historiarum.*, XI, 19.

where the magician made his appearance. He follows Dio in his description of the vision for the philosopher (and the *goês* as he calls him after Dio). Thus in Zonaras Apollonius cries: εὖ γε Στέφανε, παῖε τὸν ἀλιτήριον, ἐπληξας, ἔτρωσας, ἀπέκτεινας. Similarly John Tzetzes, a compiler of the twelfth century, had not the slightest doubts that the place where Apollonius had his telepathic experience was Ephesus; he also quotes the words of Apollonius already known to us²².

Philostratus could have heard about this event in Ephesus, in some other Ionian city, or in one of the cities which preserved the tradition of Apollonius. As a young man he probably studied in Ephesus under the supervision of the well-known sophist Damianus, and engaged himself in the sophistic arts²³. Later, perhaps already as a friend of Julia Domna, he accompanied her and her son, the Emperor Caracalla, to the East, as far as to Antioch. We shall come back to this episode below.

On the other hand, Cassius Dio might have heard about this event in Cilicia, provided he visited Aegaeae, the city where Apollonius served as a priest of Asclepios and thus became the object of a cult²⁴. Dio stayed in Cilicia when his father was its governor²⁵. Besides, Dio was born in Bithynia, where the figure of Apollonius might have been also known. After all, Bithynia was situated near the centres of Apollonius' cult in Cilicia and Cappadocia. We shall describe them in the next chapter. Apollonius was a well-known figure in eastern Asia Minor. That is why he was familiar to Cassius Dio who, apart from his "Roman" in-

²² Chiliades II, 963 f.

²³ VS, II 23 (p. 269 Wright); Bowersock (in) Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius*, op. cit., p. 15; *Greek Sophists*, op. cit., p. 4.

²⁴ Cf. ch. II p. 62.

²⁵ E. CARY (in) *Dio's Roman History*, London 1954 (Loeb), p. VII; F. MILLAR, *A Study of Cassius Dion*, Oxford 1964, pp. 19-20.

tervals, was connected with Asia Minor for his whole life.

Contrary to the wishes of the historian who always prefers independent sources to dependent ones, Grosso would like Cassius Dio to have borrowed this story from Philostratus²⁶, since it fits his conception. Yet it is contradicted by noticeable differences in the content of both versions, as well as by the chronology of Cassius Dio's work. In the years 200-222 A.D. Cassius Dio wrote the major part of his *Roman History*²⁷. It contained the history of Rome from its beginnings to the death of Septimius Severus. On the other hand VA was published about 220 A.D.²⁸. The book devoted to Domitian was written by Dio certainly before the date of publication of VA.

In Cassius Dio we can find still another important piece of information on Apollonius. It tells us about the chronology of his life. Dio claims that Apollonius' acmé fell in Domitian's time (ἐπὶ τοῦ Δομιτιανοῦ ἀνθήσαντα)²⁹. The "Philostratean" Apollonius lived from 4 or 3 B.C. till 97 A.D. (so his acmé fell in Claudius' time)³⁰. It appears from Dio's short note that in the nineties of the first century Apollonius was only 40/50 years old. It follows that he was born around 40 A.D., much later than according to Philostratus.

Cassius Dio mentions Apollonius' acmé when he describes the reign of Caracalla. His presentation of the sage is far from favourable³¹. Dio calls him simply a magician and *goés*. On the other hand, he gave a completely different

²⁶ Op. cit., p. 505.

²⁷ Cary, op. cit., p. XI.

²⁸ Bowersock (in) Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius*, op. cit. p. 9.

²⁹ LCCVII, 18, 4.

³⁰ Following Grosso (op. cit., p. 356), some authors think that Philostratus' chronology is right: see among others Lo Cascio, *La Forma Letteraria*, op. cit., pp. 34-35; J. FERGUSON, *The Religions of the the Roman Empire (Aspects of Greek and Roman Life)*, ed. by H.H. Scullard, London 1970, p. 181.

³¹ Cf. MILLAR, *A Study*, op. cit., p. 20.

picture of Apollonius when he described his appearance in Ephesus during the reign of Domitian. At that time he admired Apollonius. That is why we may treat his information on Apollonius' acmé as truthful. Had Dio written about an insignificant and despised figure he would not have had any reason to mystify. Philostratus, however, whose tendency to stray from the truth we already know, in this case also followed his custom. He squared the dates of Apollonius' life with the pseudo-historical scheme of his romance; he also indulged his sophistic inclination to archaism³².

Grosso, who puts all his scholarly efforts into finding evidence in favour of Philostratus' chronology, also refers to some letters of Apollonius. This is because he maintains that the longest letter from this collection (Epp. Apoll. 58) has a definite addressee who is easy to place in time. Moreover, Grosso claims that the addressee of this letter is mentioned in VA VII 5 as well³³.

Yet the problem of Epp. Apoll. 58 is not so simple as Grosso believes it to be. This letter is addressed to a certain Valerius. Following Norden, Grosso thinks that under this name is hidden C. Calpetanus Rantius Quirinalis Valerius Festus, a proconsul of Asia in 81/83 A.D.³⁴ Valerius Festus was, according to Grosso, the same proconsul of Asia who is mentioned, though not named, in VA VII 5 by Philostratus.

However, W. Eck's more recent studies³⁵ show that this letter was probably addressed to Valerius Asiaticus Saturninus, a proconsul of Asia in 108/109 A.D. In the light

³² Cf. E.L. BOWIE, *Greeks and their Past in the Second Sophistic*, Past and Present 46, 1970, pp. 33-34.

³³ Op. cit., p. 445.

³⁴ Ibid, p. 446, note 10.

³⁵ *Testamentum Dasumi*, Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 30, 1978, p. 292 f.

of Cassius Dio's information on Apollonius' acmé, Eck's assumption seems to be acceptable.

Apollonius, who in Domitian's times was forty or fifty years old, could have easily written a letter to Valerius Asiaticus in 108/109 A.D. The fact that it contains mediations on death allows us to assume that it was written by a man advanced in years, and its philosophical content suggests that it was probably written by the historical Apollonius³⁶. The letter, which will be dealt with more thoroughly in chapter IV, should be included with the oldest documentary materials on Apollonius. It contains philosophical views expressed most probably by the historical Apollonius, and it has a definite addressee who connects it with the same tradition, part of which is the story of Apollonius' vision in Ephesus. After all, its addressee, the proconsul of Asia, did reside in Ephesus³⁷.

Grosso's next argument for the Philostratean chronology of Apollonius' life is the date of an event described in VA I 12. It was a meeting of the young Apollonius, then aged twenty, with a wicked governor of Cilicia who, according to Philostratus, plotted against Rome with the Cappadocian king Archelaus.

As we know from Cassius Dio, King Archelaus really hatched plots against Rome and was sentenced to death by the Emperor Tiberius in 17 A.D.³⁸ Philostratus claims that he derived the information about this meeting, so unpleasant for Apollonius, from Maximus of Aegaeae who appears to have been a historical figure and as such a reliable source for Philostratus³⁹. The latter confirms our convic-

³⁶ Cf. chap. IV p. 144.

³⁷ D. MAGIE, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the Third Century after Christ*, I Princeton 1950, p. 583.

³⁸ W.E. GWATKIN, *Cappadocia as a Procuratorial Province*, University of Missouri Studies V, 4, 1930, pp. 7-16.

³⁹ Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire*, Oxford 1969, p. 19

tion that Maximus was a historical figure when he writes that Maximus was the emperor's secretary *ab epistulis graecis* (I 12).

Maximus described Apollonius' stay in Aegaeae and in Cilicia in a booklet entitled *Τὰ ἐν Αἰγαῖς Ἀπολλωνίου πάντα* which is referred to by Philostratus in VA I 7 - 13 (or even up to 16). The discovery of the Adana inscription which comes most probably from Aegaeae⁴⁰ confirms the historicity of Apollonius' links with Cilicia and thus adds value to the Cilician biography of the philosopher and to the figure of Maximus.

If we put confidence in these sources of Philostratus, we should follow Grosso in his assumption that Apollonius not only lived in 17 A.D. but also that he was then about twenty years old (I 13). However, since we know Philostratus, we cannot be absolutely certain that he copied Maximus' text faithfully, the more so as here he made a basic historical mistake. At that time Cilicia was not a separate province, and therefore it could not have a governor⁴¹.

On the other hand, it is quite possible that Philostratus had in mind the Cilicia of his times, and introduced to the content of Maximus' work the story about King Archelaus which he had just read in Cassius Dio⁴². Philostratus was sure to have known Cassius Dio's work which at that time was gradually coming into being. After all, he was his close acquaintance as they both belonged to the circle of Julia Domna⁴³.

and note 7; Meyer, *op. cit.*, pp. 401-402, doubted the historicity of Maximus; this source is largely relied on by L. ROBERT in *De Cilicie à Messine et à Plymouth avec deux Inscriptions grecques errantes*, *Journal des Savants* 1973, p. 185.

⁴⁰ See chapter II, p. 64.

⁴¹ M. PANI, *Roma e i Re d'Oriente da Augusto a Tiberio*, Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Bari 11, Bari 1972, pp. 195-98.

⁴² Gwatkin, *op. cit.*, pp. 7-16.

⁴³ Bowersock, *Greek Sophists*, *op. cit.*, p. 101 f; in this context it is difficult

To associate Apollonius with Tiberius' time seems to be illogical even in the context of VA. Apart from this isolated case, Philostratus links Apollonius neither with Tiberius, Caligula and Claudius, nor with any people from their attendants. During the reigns of those rulers Apollonius was a young man, and Philostratus made him travel to Persia and India. It was only in Nero's time that he brought Apollonius into the political stage when he described his first voyage to Greece (IV 20).

We also have at our disposal some other sources which corroborate Cassius Dio's information⁴⁴. In Eusebius' *Chronicle* Apollonius' acmé is said to have fallen in the sixteenth year of Domitian's principate, that is in 96 A.D.⁴⁵ John Malalas, a historian of Antioch and an expert, as we shall see later, in the legend of Apollonius, places his acmé also in Domitian's times⁴⁶. We find the same information in *Chronicon Paschale* which (along with the sources mentioned above) allowed Meyer to decide on the year 120 A.D. as the date of Apollonius' death⁴⁷. St. Jerome writes that Apollonius was contemporary with Euphrates (Apollonius Tyaneus et Euphrates insignes philosophi habentur)⁴⁸. According to St. Jerome, Euphrates died in 121 A.D., but according to Cassius Dio in 119 A.D.⁴⁹. Gregory Cedrenos, a Byzantine monk of

to resist an assumption that it was Dio's work that Philostratus utilized in his description of a parapsychic «spectacle» delivered by Apollonius in Ephesus. Yet as I have tried to prove above, we remain certain that Philostratus, like Dio, had access to the independent Ephesian tradition concerning the magician Apollonius. That is why in VA he presented the version of this event which is different in many details from the one by the historian.

⁴⁴ Cf. Grosso, op. cit., p. 357.

⁴⁵ Hieronymus, *Chronicon*, sub anno 96, p. 192 Helm.

⁴⁶ *Chronographia* X, p. 263 Bonn.

⁴⁷ *Chronicon Paschale*, pp. 467 and 475 Bonn *Chronicon Paschale* places Apollonius' death in the year 123 A.D.; Meyer, op. cit. p. 404.

⁴⁸ Hieronymus, *Chron.*, sub anno 121, p. 198 Helm.

⁴⁹ LXIX, 8,3.

the eleventh century, describes Apollonius' magical activities as taking place also during the reign of Domitian⁵⁰.

St. Jerome makes the lives of Apollonius and Euphrates synchronous. Apollonius' conflict with Euphrates is one of the most important plots of VA. The dramatic contention between both philosophers is also reflected in the letters. Besides, in VA Apollonius is closely related to Dio Chrysostom and Scopelianus, both of whom died at the beginning of the second century. In the life of Dio Chrysostom contained in VS Philostratus claims that Dio, Euphrates, and Apollonius lived at the same time⁵¹. We do not know the exact date of Dio's death. Jones believes that he died in 110 A.D., and was born about 40/50 A.D.⁵². Apollonius, who died when he was at least eighty years old (VA VIII 29), outlived Dio Chrysostom and died, in the light of our argument which supports Meyer's point, about 120 A.D.

We already know that Apollonius wrote to Valerius Asiaticus as an old man. VA (I 24) tells us that in his late years he wrote a letter to Scopelianus, too. According to Philostratus, Scopelianus was still alive in 113 A.D.⁵³. In the life of Scopelianus contained in VS Philostratus claims that this well-known sophist of Asia Minor was contemporary with Apollonius⁵⁴. We do not know the date of Scopelianus' birth. The History connects him also with the Emperor Domitian, as it was he who headed the deputation of the Ionian cities to this emperor because of his vine edict⁵⁵.

⁵⁰ *Historiarum Compendium* I, p. 431 Bonn.

⁵¹ VS I 7 (p. 19 Wright).

⁵² *The Roman World*, op. cit., pp. 133 and 140.

⁵³ VS I 25 (p. 119 Wright).

⁵⁴ VS I 21 (p. 89 Wright); here Philostratus writes that Scopelianus admired Apollonius.

⁵⁵ Penella, *The Letters*, op. cit., p. 102; Grosso, op. cit., pp. 443-44.

In order to conclude our considerations on the dates of Apollonius' life, it is worth referring here to Lucian as the first historically reliable source which mentions Apollonius.

In his dialogue *Alexander sive Pseudomantis* Lucian writes that Alexander, a false prophet, had a preceptor who was a disciple of Apollonius of Tyana⁵⁶. As we know, Alexander died between 168 and 177 A.D. when he was seventy years old⁵⁷. Therefore the years of his studies under the supervision of the aforementioned disciple should be stated as 120-130 A.D. It was either at the point of Apollonius' death or soon afterward. Apollonius, who died about 120, might have had educated disciples at the end of his life who, in turn, already taught their successors.

While looking for some corroboration of our chronology in medieval sources concerning Apollonius, we should notice that the Arabic tradition also places Apollonius' mature life in Domitian's time⁵⁸.

Among a hundred letters collected by Penella and connected with the name of Apollonius⁵⁹, there are also two letters addressed to Domitian (Epp. Apoll. 20 and 21). Besides, in VA VII 35 Philostratus mentions a certain letter written by Apollonius to Domitian where the sage asks the emperor for mercy. Philostratus holds that this letter was written by certain enemies of Apollonius: οἱ βασκάνως ταῦτα ξυνθέντες⁶⁰. In fact, it was probably written by Philostratus himself in order to magnify the seriousness of

⁵⁶ Alex. 5.

⁵⁷ Bowie, op. cit., p. 1678; PIR² A 506.

⁵⁸ Weisser, *Das Buch über das Geheimnis der Schöpfung*, op. cit., pp. 22-23.

⁵⁹ Penella, *The Letters*, op. cit., pp. 1-4. The majority of Apollonius' letters has persisted till our times in the separately transmitted collection. Philostratus quotes fourteen letters which, besides, are repeated in the separate collection. As to other letters, Philostratus only relates or mentions them; still other are contained in the Stobaeus *Anthology*.

⁶⁰ Penella, *ibid.*, pp. 141-142.

Apollonius' trial and the way he was beset by slanderers and informers.

Characteristically enough, Philostratus does not know the letters addressed to Domitian and contained in the epistolary collection, whereas in VA he quotes other letters addressed to Vespasian, Nerva, and Titus in their entirety⁶¹. We have the right to assume that they were invented by Philostratus and then repeated in the independently transmitted collection of letters.

This conclusion should not make us too hastily accept the letters to Domitian as the real letters written by Apollonius. We cannot be certain that they were not fabricated by later forgers on the basis of VA. In the whole collection of Apollonius letters it is possible to find some which can be safely said to have been invented before VA. Here we can include the aforementioned consolatory letter to Valerius. However, this assumption is the result of our acquaintance with the "Question of Apollonius" and does not find its corroboration in reliable and numerous sources of the second century which originated before VA. That is why we cannot determine whether both letters addressed to Domitian were written before Philostratus, or whether they originated because of his work. Yet we are entitled to assume that they were invented by fabricators who had some information on the historical Apollonius. They know that Apollonius had not established personal contacts with Domitian and yet he had been interested in his rule. So they associated Apollonius with the emperor only by means of correspondence. Here Apollonius criticizes Domitian's rule and tries to show him that political wisdom of the ruler determines the character of his reign (Epp. Apoll. 20).

Because of this problem it is worth paying attention to another letter of Apollonius (Epp. Apoll. 14). It is not cer-

⁶¹ Those are Epp. Apoll. 42f; g; h; 77f; 77d; App. 10; 11; 15; 16.

tain that it was invented on the basis of VA. We read there that Apollonius had never been either to Italy or to the emperor's court. This letter tells the truth about Apollonius. After all, each of us is certain to have some doubts as to the quality of Philostratan descriptions of Apollonius' travels to the West, his meetings with the emperor's officials in Rome, and his meeting with the Emperor Domitian at the supreme tribunal. We shall prove below that these doubts are legitimate.

It follows that the Apollonius who only engages in correspondence with the emperors is far more convincing for us. Here we can detect a certain tact displayed by the inventors of Apollonius' tradition. They did not want to go too far in their fabrications concerning the sage of Tyana. On the other hand, Philostratus, whose work is by no means short of Apollonius' letters, did not show so much decency and made Apollonius meet the emperors in Italy and elsewhere: in Egypt and in Antioch. This literary device allowed Philostratus to dramatize his romance.

We know only one reliable piece of information on the relationship between Apollonius and Domitian, or rather on Apollonius' attitude towards Domitian, since it is doubtful whether the emperor could have had an attitude towards the Cappadocian magician at all. This information tells us that Apollonius regarded Domitian as a tyrant, and that his antipathy to the emperor was so strong that he found his death a propitious and happy event. In 89 A.D. Domitian expelled all the philosophers and astrologers from Rome. In 93/4 he launched a new attack against philosophy, and in 95 he ordered that philosophers should leave not only Rome but the whole territory of Italy as well ⁶².

⁶² CAH XI, Cambridge 1936, pp. 27; 30-32; A. BALLANTI, *Documenti sull'Opposizione degli Intellettuali a Domiziano*, Annali della Facoltà di Letteratura e Filologia dell'Università di Napoli IV, 1954, pp. 76-95.

So it was not only in the West that this fact was known. Apollonius, himself a philosopher and magician, regarded Domitian's persecution of those people as a personal blow. This prompted him to express publicly his satisfaction at the tyrant's death. The event took place in Ephesus. It is mentioned by Cassius Dio, and Philostratus heard about it either in his youth or, more probably, when he was gathering materials for his romance. On the basis of this hearsay preserved by tradition, Philostratus contrived the whole drama of the philosopher fighting against tyranny (VII and VIII *passim*); the drama concluded with his magnificent, Socratic apologia⁶³. To frame this story Philostratus utilized the patterns contained in Pythagoras' biography, in Greek Romance, and in *Acta Martyrum* which assumed their final form and circulated in Alexandria⁶⁴ just at the time of the writing of VA.

Our epistolary collection also comprises letters addressed to other figures that are known to us from the memoirs of "Damis": Dio Chrysostom, Scopelianus, Musonius Rufus, Demetrius and Euphrates.

The letters to Musonius Rufus (Epp. Apoll. 42 b-e) and to Demetrius (Epp. Apoll. 77 e) are fully quoted in VA. They were probably invented by Philostratus just like his stories in VA about Apollonius' friendship with those two philosophers of the first century. As I have already written, these naive fabrications were discredited by Bowersock and Bowie.

Furthermore, there are no real grounds for assuming that Apollonius carried on correspondence with another acquaintance from VA, that is with the sophist Scopelianus. This

⁶³ It appears even in the catalogue of Apollonius' works in *Suda Lexicon* as a separate entry (cf. chap. IV, p. 130).

⁶⁴ Bowie, *op. cit.*, p. 1665; cf. also my article (M. JÓZEFOWICZ-DZIELSKA, *La Participation du Milieu d'Alexandrie à la Discussion sur l'Idéal du Souverain dans les deux premiers Siècles de l'Empire Romain*, *Eos* LXIV, 1976, pp. 47-55).

is the next example of Philostratus', literary figments of imagination. In one of his studies ⁶⁵ Penella shows to what extent Philostratus remained under the influence of this philosopher and his rhetorical speeches. Bowie pays attention to this problem too, and reveals similarities between some facts from Apollonius' life (his birth) and the life of Scopelianus described by Philostratus in VS ⁶⁶.

Apollonius was said to have written two letters to Scopelianus. One of them is preserved in the independently transmitted collection (Epp. Apoll. 19) and the second one in VA I 23-24 (Epp. Apoll. 2a; b). It is difficult to assume that they are pre-Philostratean inventions ⁶⁷. It was Philostratus himself who called them into being, and, not without reason, he presented Apollonius as Scopelianus' acquaintance.

As we have noticed Scopelianus was contemporary with Apollonius and opposed Domitian's political moves. After all, he acted as an envoy to the emperor to ask him to withdraw his vine edict. Scopelianus in this role is also mentioned in VA by Philostratus (VI 42). Yet he claims that Apollonius was the initiator of this move.

The problem of Apollonius' relationship with Dio Chrysostom also raises many doubts. The only thing we can state for certain is that they both lived in the same time. However, it is also possible that Apollonius was associated with Dio already in pre-Philostratean times.

From among the three letters to Dio Chrysostom (Epp. Apoll. 9; 10; 90) it is the tenth one which attracts particular attention. Here we meet an Apollonius who does not resemble the Apollonius from VA. According to my

⁶⁵ *Scopelianus and the Eretrians in Cissia*, op. cit. pp. 295-300.

⁶⁶ Op. cit., pp. 1666-67.

⁶⁷ Penella, *The Letters*, op. cit., p. 138 is inclined to regard the letter mentioned by Philostratus (VA I 23-24) as written earlier by somebody else.

opinion, he is much closer to the historical Apollonius who, as we shall demonstrate in chapter II, was not involved in public discourse. In the letter he appears to be disillusioned with public appearances and is not interested in teaching. In VA Apollonius' idea is to preach to all people. In the aforementioned letter Apollonius believes that the inhabitants of the Ionian cities do not understand him. He lost heart over his Greek audience and his renown as a sophist ceased to appeal to him. This altogether non-sophistic Apollonius appears also in certain letters addressed to Euphrates (for example in Epp. Apoll. 8). Here Euphrates reproaches Apollonius with his lack of consideration for activities appropriate to the sophist. This information is pre-Philostratean in its character. As we shall see below, the letters to Euphrates were fabricated most probably in the second century, soon after the death of Euphrates and Apollonius.

The remaining two letters to Dio Chrysostom (Epp. Apoll. 9 and 70) are certain to have been invented on the basis of VA ⁶⁸.

Bowie's studies show how much Philostratus was impressed with Dio Chrysostom's life and activities, when he was shaping the hero of his romance ⁶⁹. The same fact is emphasized by Desideri ⁷⁰, and especially by Moles ⁷¹. The letter holds that Philostratus aimed to introduce Apollonius into the society of his contemporary philosophers. That is why he associated him with the philosophers attached to the Flavian dynasty and made him, together with Dio Chrysostom and Euphrates, Vespasian's adviser in Alexandria ⁷². All the philosophers who are known to Apollonius

⁶⁸ Moles, *The Career and Conversion*, op. cit., p. 87.

⁶⁹ Op. cit., pp. 1668-69.

⁷⁰ Dione di Prusa, op. cit., pp. 13-15; 35; 56-57.

⁷¹ *The Career and Conversion*, op. cit., pp. 84-85.

⁷² The problem of the meeting between Apollonius and two other philosophers

in VA and in his letters were associated themselves in one way or another. Musonius Rufus was Euphrates' and Dio Chrysostom's preceptor, whereas Demetrius was acquainted with Musonius Rufus⁷³.

The very fact that Dio Chrysostom was persecuted by Domitian appears to have been a sufficient inspirations for Philostratus. After all, Dio was expelled from Rome by the tyrant whom Apollonius hated. Domitian suspected Apollonius of taking part in a plot allegedly prepared against him by the emperor's cousin Flavius Sabinus⁷⁴.

We cannot state with sufficient accuracy to what extent Philostratus remained under the influence of Dio Chrysostom's life and banishment when he was writing VA. We also do not know how much literary inspiration he owed to Dio's speeches delivered during his exile. A separate problem concerns the studies of the dependence of VA in *Vitae Sophistarum*, the next great work by Philostratus. For the first time this problem was raised by Bowie. In my opinion, it should find its further continuation and elaboration in Philostratean studies.

However, the main addressee of Apollonius' letters is Euphrates (Epp. Apoll. 1-8; 14-18; 50-52; 60-74; 77; 82; 94; App. 4). Thanks to Bowie's findings we know now that the letters to Euphrates were invented most probably in pre-Philostratean times. Bowie pointed out that the early traditon had known the conflict between Apollonius and Euphrates. It is mentioned by Moiragenes, a pre-

with Vespasian in Alexandria come to be the subject of many studies. It is Bowie summarizes the results of the studies carried out hitherto (op. cit., pp. 1660-62). He also contributes his own remarks on this subject. Moles, op. cit., p. 83 claims that the event which took place in Alexandria is a sheer figment of Philostratus' imagination, and that it contains, τόποι familiar from historiography, (Herodotus, Cassius Dio).

⁷³ Bowie, op. cit. p. 1659.

⁷⁴ Jones, *The Roman World*, op. cit., p. 45; Moles, op. cit., pp. 83-87; Desideri, op. cit., pp. 187-200.

Philostratean biographer of Apollonius, in his work which Philostratus used extensively as his source, though he imputed ignorance to its author (VA I 3). Philostratus writes that Moiragenes' work consisted of four books; thanks to Origen we know this fragment⁷⁵. It is worth quoting here in its entirety, since we shall return to it in further chapters of the present work. This is what Moiragenes wrote: ἀναγνώτω τὰ γεγραμμένα Μοιραγένει Τῶν Ἀπολλωνίου τοῦ Τυανέως μάγου καὶ φιλοσόφου ἀπομνημονευμάτων: ἐν οἷς ὁ μὴ Χριστιανὸς ἀλλὰ φιλόσοφος ἔφησεν ἀλῶναι ὑπο τῆς ἐν Ἀπολλωνίῳ μαγείας οὐκ ἀγεννεῖς τινὰς φιλοσόφους ὡς πρὸς γόητα αὐτὸν εἰσελθόντας ἐν οἷς οἶμαι καὶ περὶ Εὐφράτου τοῦ πάνυ διηγήσατο καὶ τινος Ἐπικουρείου.

The fragment tells us that Moiragenes' work was entitled: Τὰ Ἀπολλωνίου τοῦ Τυανέως μάγου καὶ φιλοσόφου ἀπομνημονεύματα, and that it is concerned with, among others, the conflict between Apollonius and Euphrates, and a certain Epicurean philosopher. To both philosophers Apollonius displayed the strength and might of his μαγεία. Since then both philosophers began to consider Apollonius a charlatan. In that way Moiragenes confronted Apollonius with the famous Stoic and Epicurean philosophers in order to bring out the idiosyncratic qualities of the magician's philosophical thought. We may venture a guess that Moiragenes must have described many "magical" activities of Apollonius. Yet only the aforementioned fragment of his work has survived to this day.

The differences between Apollonius and Euphrates become manifest also in the letters to Euphrates, where both philosophers representing two distinct philosophical systems of thought, insult each other aggressively.

Bowie noticed this similarity of tendency between the fragment written by Moiragenes and the letters to Euphrates. On this basis he framed an interesting hypothesis on the origin of the conflict between both philosophers. He assumed that this dramatic contention had been elaborated very early, probably soon after the death of both of them, by Apollonius' followers and admirers⁷⁶. To all appearances, they fabricated the letters to Euphrates contained just in the epistolary collection ascribed to Apollonius. The letters to Euphrates might have been already quoted by Moiragenes in his *Apomnèmata* which, according to Bowie, originated approximately in the middle of the second century⁷⁷. Also Philostratus himself places the invention of the letters in more or less the same century; he writes that certain (!) letters of Apollonius (maybe just those addressed to Euphrates) were handed over to the Emperor Hadrian together with a volume of Pythagoras' maxims (Δόξαι Πυθαγόρου), which Apollonius had taken away from the cavern of Trophonius (VIII 20). Those two literary relics were stored in the emperor's villa at Antium⁷⁸. Also Philostratus claims that he knew of many letters to Euphrates, but Penella managed to pick up a quotation from only one of them⁷⁹.

We do not know any other historical sources which would tell us more about Apollonius' acquaintanceship with Euphrates. Yet, even in the light of scarce but reliable data which we have at our disposal thanks to Moiragenes' original work, we may assume that the historical Apollonius could have known Euphrates.

⁷⁶ Op. cit., p. 1678.

⁷⁷ Ibid., pp. 1675-79.

⁷⁸ F. MILLAR, *The Emperor in the Roman World (31 bc - ad 337)*, London 1977, p. 16, holds that the possibility of seeing the letters of Apollonius in Antium was an attraction for tourists, in the same way as the jewellery given to Tiberius by Pompeius Sextus' wife and preserved in Baiae.

⁷⁹ App. 4.

Euphrates was a Syrian, probably from Tyre⁸⁰. On the basis mentioned above we know that he was contemporary with Apollonius. Till 96 A.D. Euphrates stayed and taught in Syria. Then he moved to Rome. It seems that Apollonius also visited northern Syria; at any rate he visited Antioch where he was well known and respected⁸¹.

Apollonius' philosophy, which will be dealt with in chapter IV, probably did not appeal to Euphrates who considered it solely as magic and divination. Philosophical traditions followed by both philosophers were completely different; Apollonius was involved in what F.E. Peters calls "secret discourse with God"⁸². Hence the mutual disagreement between both philosophers. P. Grimal regards this disagreement as the lack of understanding between the man of the world and the ascetic⁸³. Euphrates was a friend to Roman aristocrats - he was adored and esteemed in those circles. He was on friendly terms with Pliny the Younger who met Euphrates during his military service in Syria in 81/83; Euphrates' wife was a daughter of Pompeius Iulianus, one of the most influential men in Syria; Roman authors treated him very respectfully in their writings⁸⁴. But above all he represented Stoicism, the philosophy which was most popular at that time, and which in the second century won over many emperors⁸⁵. On the other hand,

⁸⁰ PIR² E 121; H. von Arnim, *Euphrates von Tyrus*, RE 6,1, col. 1216; P. GRIMAL, *Deux Figures de la Correspondance de Pline: le Philosophe Euphratès et le Rhéteur Isée*, Latomus XIV, 1955, p. 371; Penella, op. cit., p. 91.

⁸¹ See chap. II, p. 75 and chap. III, p. 107; 122 f. According to the Arabic tradition Apollonius visited even Tyre (ibid.).

⁸² *The Harvest of Hellenism, a History of the Near East to the Triumph of Christianity*, New York, pp. 458-59.

⁸³ Op. cit., p. 372.

⁸⁴ Ibid., pp. 372-73; Penella, op. cit., pp. 89-90.

⁸⁵ Euphrates preached Stoicism in Syria and then in Rome at the time when the philosophy represented by Apollonius was only of secondary interest. It was Stoicism and akin to it Cynicism that played first fiddle. In the first century particular representatives of Platonism or Pythagoreanism found their place even

Apollonius had few admirers among his contemporaries; nobody paid due attention to a provincial Cappadocian mystic. Euphrates, who carried out his activities on adjoining territories, must have ridiculed Apollonius' religiousness and his way of philosophising, without taking much trouble to understand it.

Philostratus, as well as earlier Moiragenes and pre-Philostratean fabricators of the letters, might have known the patronizing attitude of the Stoic philosopher towards his colleague who thought in a different manner and was less known. Philostratus elaborated this account into a vehement contention which occupies much space in VA. He

at the side of the emperors, like, for instance, Thrasyllus of Alexandria, a Platonist and Pythagorean who was a philosopher at the court of Tiberius (cf. J. DILLON, *The Middle Platonists, a Study of Platonism 80 b.c. to a.d. 200*, Duckworth, London 1977, p. 185.) Plutarch, a disciple of the Platonist Ammonius, maintained friendly relations with many influential figures in Rome, and acted as a public prosecutor of Achaia under Hadrian (Dillon, *ibid.*, p. 186) Yet these schools had never achieved such a position as Stoicism. In the first century Stoic philosophers suffered persecution because of their views. In Nero's time Seneca and Barea Soranus were sentenced to death. Musonius Rufus the Stoic was twice expelled from Rome at that time. During the «purge» of philosophers carried out by Vespasian, Helvidius Priscus was sentenced to death, and Demetrius the Cynic was expelled from Rome. Dio Chrysostom was banished from Rome during the reign of Domitian (Desideri, *op. cit.*, pp. 187-200; Jones, *op. cit.*, p. 45 f.; Moles, *op. cit.*, pp. 83-87.) In the second century the Stoic philosophy and its ideas gained a victory. The subsequent emperors, from Nerva to Marcus Aurelius, supported it and were guided by its ideals (cf. P. NOYEN, *Marcus Aurelius, The greatest Practician of Stoicism*, *Antiquité Classique* 24, 1955, pp. 272-383.) Marcus Aurelius followed this philosophy in his private life. Along with Cynics, Stoic philosophers had a considerable influence on the emperors' cultural policy, and during the reign of Trajan Dio Chrysostom could safely address his speeches to the emperor, having in mind probably Trajan (Jones, *op. cit.*, pp. 15-23). The empire gave support to this philosophy as it advocated the idea of the state which was akin to universalist tendencies of the Roman Empire; besides it created the ideal of the ruler whose main traits should be moral and intellectual virtues (G. GIANELLI, S. MAZZARINO, *Trattato di Storia romana* II, Roma, pp. 205-17; M. JÓZEFOWICZ, *Les Idées politiques dans la Morale stoiciens de Marc-Aurèle*, *Eos* LIX, 1971, pp. 241-54; P. CHARLESWORTH, *The Virtues of the Roman Emperor*, *Proceedings of the British Academy* XXIII, 1937; pp. 100-14; R.

made Euphrates write ψευδῆ γράμματα (I 13) against Apollonius, tried to prove that Euphrates accused Apollonius before Domitian using his paid informer (VII 9; VIII 3), and that still earlier he had defamed the sage in front of the Gymnosophists in Ethiopia (VI 7; 9).

Having in mind the tradition of the conflict deeply rooted in pre-Philostratean times, and Apollonius' acquaintanceship with Euphrates, I am inclined to assume that Euphrates is the only figure appearing in the memoirs of "Damis" who was somehow related to the historical Apollonius. This argument will find its further confirmation in chapter IV which deals with Apollonius' philosophy.

HOISTAD, *Cynic Hero and Cynic King*, Uppsala 1948.) It is small wonder then that the philosopher of Tyana came off poorly against such rivalry. In order to strengthen his position, Moiragenes made him win in the conflict with Euphrates, whereas the authors of the letters demonstrated the superiority of Apollonius' philosophy to the Stoicism represented by Euphrates. Philostratus introduced Apollonius into the world of the Stoico-Cynical philosophy of the first century. He let him make friends with Musonius Rufus, with the Cynic Demetrius and with the "Cynicizing" Dio Chrysostom. He shaped his life according to the patterns taken from the life of Dio Chrysostom and of other well-known sophists of the second century. Furthermore, he showed him as the author of the theory of monarchy. Placing him side by side with theoreticians of monarchy of the first and second centuries he made him the adviser of the emperors: Vespasian, Titus, Nerva, and even of the Parthian king Vardanes. Finally, following the example of Stoic and Cynic martyrs he made him a victim of persecution of the same kind as that directed against his friends Musonius Rufus, Demetrius and Dio Chrysostom.

CHAPTER II

APOLLONIUS AND HIS CITIES

Cassius Dio described Apollonius' vision in Ephesus. Probably it was also in Ephesus that Valerius, the addressee of Apollonius' long consolatory letter, had his residence. Furthermore, if Philostratus is to be believed, Apollonius demonstrated his supernatural ability to understand the language of birds (VA IV 3) in the same city too. This art of Apollonius is also mentioned by Porphyry in *De Abstinencia*¹. Porphyry, regarding this ability with a seriousness characteristic of the ancients, reckons Apollonius as "one of those rare Greeks who understood the language of birds". He is familiar with a story telling how Apollonius learnt about the grain scattered on the road from a swallow which had come to its companions crying joyfully in order to impart the news to them and to invite them to a feast. In VA Apollonius wove this conversation of the birds (here sparrows, not swallows) into his homily addressed to the citizens of Ephesus. He contrasted the exemplary behaviour of the birds with the Ephesians who pursued their own interests and amassed material goods out of egoistic motives.

This fabulous story narrated by Porphyry about the magician who understood the language of the birds is similar in its drift to Cassius Dio's description of the magician's vision in Ephesus where Apollonius cried out in happiness because of the tyrant's death in Rome. Both cases involve Apollonius' magical abilities. Porphyry only confirms what Cassius Dio knew about Apollonius: in the opinion of the

¹ III, 3; on Porphyry's acquaintanceship with Apollonius see chapter IV, p. 136 f.

Greeks he was a magician, sometimes referred to even as a *goès*. Yet we should still remember that Porphyry knew Apollonius as a philosopher and as such he found him most interesting². Consequently, Porphyry might have known something about moralizing activities of this Pythagorean in the Greek cities. Moreover, it is highly probable that he derived the story about the magician who understood the language of the birds from a certain homily delivered by Apollonius in Ephesus, the homily which Philostratus preserved in its entirety³.

The sources at our disposal corroborate this assumption. We learn from them that the historical Apollonius visited some Greek cities (we already know that he was at Ephesus), and that he left behind him thankful memories. He was remembered there as a visionary and a prophet, as a physician and a healer. Our data on Apollonius' stay in Aegaeae and in Antioch clearly suggest that he acted as a moralist in those cities. That is why the Ephesian story reported by Philostratus about the magician who during his "moralizing" also displayed his magical powers may be genuine. Apollonius was not only a physician in the common sense of the word, but he was also a physician of souls. The latter he understood as help offered by a sage moralist in suppressing bad inclination of the soul, the help similar to that rendered by a physician and his medicins to cure the body. The Adana inscription, which will be dealt with later, clearly says that ἀνθρώπων ἔσβεσεν ἁμπλακίας. As we know, Apollonius attributed his healing powers (concerning both the body and the soul) to magic which, after all, was his most important power. His moralizing did not consist in rhetorical displays and thus - contrary to Philostratus

² Ibid.

³ Bowie, *op. cit.*, p. 1687 holds that Porphyry did not borrow this story from Philostratus but that both authors referred to the same Ephesian tradition.

- he could not have been a famous sophist and orator. He is likely to have had some rhetorical skills and an extensive, though certainly not academic, philosophical culture. Yet it was not because of them that he acquired, first local, and posthumously more wide-spread, fame. It should be ascribed to his magic.

Philostratus, however, portrays Apollonius as an outstanding sophist widely known in the Greek cities. He claims that Apollonius' speeches were renowned in eastern Asia Minor, in Ionia and in Hellas (VA IV, *passim*). Philostratus writes that on his way back from Apollonius was welcomed in Ionia as a well-known sophist, that numerous cities invited him for a stay, sent deputations to him, asked his advice on local matters, and expected his mediations (IV 1)⁴. Throughout the whole biographical work Philostratus praises Apollonius' rhetorical talents and makes him deliver spectacular declamatory speeches⁵. Yet none of the sources

⁴ Philostratus contradicts himself when he describes Apollonius' sophistic activity. On the one hand he insists that Apollonius was not a sophist but only φιλόσοφος (I 2; 7; 16; II 20-26; 40), and he criticizes rhetoric as a means used by those sophists who seek glare and cheap popularity (IV 27; VII 16; VIII 21); he tries to pose Apollonius as a pre-Socratean sage (cf. Belloni, *Aspetti dell'antica ΣΟΦΙΑ in Apollonio di Tiana*, op. cit., pp. 140-49) infatuated with the old regime and with the old customs (I 38; IV 18; 22; 32; VI 20-21; VIII 7,7). On the other hand he describes typically sophist appearances of Apollonius in various cities of Asia Minor and he holds that what characterized Apollonius' every-day practice was διάλεξις ἐς πάντας (I 16; IV 41; VIII 26), and he regards otherwise despised sophistry as an art of the first rank (τεχνῶν σοφαί VIII 7,4). Apollonius' behaviour as an orator, and the content of his speeches agree with the requirements concerning a professional sophist as laid down by Aelius Aristides (Or. 46, p. 404 Dindorf). On Apollonius' attitude towards sophistry and rhetoric see R.J. PENELLA, *Philostratus Letter to Julia Domna*, *Hermes* 107, 2, 1979, pp. 165-68. The terms rhetor and sophist that appear in the Second Sophistic are discussed by Bowersock, *Greek Sophists* op. cit., pp. 12-14, and Penella, *The Letters*, Op. cit., pp. 89-91.

⁵ B.P. REARDON classifies literary forms in VA characteristic for the Second Sophistic in his *Courants Littéraires Grecs des II^e et III^e Siècles après J - C*, op. cit. pp. 266-67 and note 98.

besides Philostratus and the letters⁶ (the latter, as we know, of a doubtful origin) mentions Apollonius as a sophist. We know nothing about his speeches and teachings in the Greek part of the Empire, or about Domitian's reaction to his rhetorical skills. None of the sources mentions deputations sent by numerous cities which would ask him for advice and instructions or for his visits. As all the reliable sources indicate, this nimbus of glory surrounding Apollonius the sophist was created by Philostratus himself⁷, as in the case of Apollonius' brilliant apology

⁶ A large group of Apollonius' letters is addressed to Greek cities. Apollonius criticizes their citizens for moral decline and pro-Roman attitude (Epp. Apoll. 30; 3; 38; 54; 63; 70-72/ and he acts as a mediator in their local conflicts (38-41; 56; 75; 75a; 76). Bowie (op. cit., pp. 1681-82) assumes that those letters were invented in pre-Philostratean times and were utilized by Philostratus in VA. Those letters, "of the corrective type" as Bowie calls them, were used by Philostratus whenever he criticized the Greeks in VA. Furthermore, Bowie suggests that those "corrective" letters were invented in Hadrian's time, since they correspond with its ideals. Their fabricators ascribed to Apollonius the ideals they professed. Already in the letters Apollonius obtains various honours for his rhetorical activities. In Epp. Apoll. 53 he is bestowed with special honours for his philosophical and moralizing activities (cf. C.P. JONES, *A Martyria for Apollonius of Tyana*, Chiron 12, 1982, pp. 137-144); in Epp. Apoll. 62 special privileges were conferred on him, as we have already mentioned, by the Lacedaemonians. In other letters, as we remember from the previous chapter (Epp. Apoll. 10 and 34) we read that after a short period of his "performances" in the Greek cities, Apollonius renounced his public teachings. In Epp. Apoll. 1; 2; 6 and 7 Apollonius states that σοφιστεία means a paid teaching, a greed for profits and for exerting influence at the emperor's court (cf. Epp. Apoll. 51).

⁷ It is possible that it was already Maximus of Aegaeae who invented Apollonius the sophist. After all, he described Apollonius' stay at the Asclepeion at Aegaeae which at the same time was the place of sophistic studies. On the other hand, his description of Apollonius' activity as a priest of Asclepius implies that Apollonius only improved faults and character of his patients. We discuss it thoroughly in this chapter. A description of Apollonius' interference with hunger conflicts in Aspendus (VA I 15; Epp. Apoll. 77a) is of a different character and dates back probably to Maximus. Maximus — if not Philostratus — who invented this story, referred to well-known cases of sophists' interference with local affairs and conflicts of the Greek cities at the end of the first and second centuries (cf. F. MILLAR, *The Roman Empire and its Neighbours*, London 1967, pp. 65-66; Magie, *The Roman Rule I*, op. cit., pp. 599-602; M. STAHL, *Im-*

delivered before Domitian. Had Apollonius' been half as outstanding a sophist and teacher as Philostratus made him be, we would have certainly met some monuments of gratitude built in commemoration of his declarations and teachings. In truth, however, we do not even know any single inscription which would confirm his achievements as a sophist, let alone the list of honours allegedly bestowed on him by Sparta for his speeches condemning its decline (IV 31-32; Epp. Apoll. 62), or a decree in which the inhabitants of Tarsus called him, out of their gratitude for his teachings, the second founder of their city and its supporter (IV 34). It is beyond doubt that Philostratus shaped the figure of Apollonius looking at famous sophists such as Dio Chrysostom or Scopelianus as his models. We have already touched this problem in the previous chapter. It is almost certain that Philostratus followed earlier works on Apollonius. Already there Apollonius appeared as a sophist⁸.

As a magician who often advised people, Apollonius visited several cities. Philostratus described his visits in dozens of cities situated both in various parts of the Empire and outside its boundaries: in Persia and in India. Yet

periale Herrschaft und provinzielle Stadt, Hypomnèmata H. 52, Göttingen 1978, p. 173). It seems possible that the author or this story followed one of Dio Chrysostom's speeches (Or.46) who had presented his intervention during the hunger rebellion at his native Prusa (cf. JONES, *The Roman World*, op. cit., pp. 20-21; Bowie, op.cit., p. 1690 and note 14).

⁸ See note 5 and 6 and p. 81 where we discuss Epp. Apoll. 62. The majority of the authors of monographic works on Apollonius assume that the stories in VA telling about Apollonius' sophistic and educational activities are true (cf. among others F.W. CAMPBELL, *Apollonius of Tyana, A Study of his Life and Times*, London 1908, p. 20 ff.; Lo Cascio, op. cit., p. 46; Grosso, op. cit., passim; also Bowie, op. cit., p. 1680 holds that Apollonius' interventions in the conflicts between the cities of Asia Minor might be acknowledged as historically valid. In the light of Jones' latest studies of Epp. Apoll. 53 (*A Martyria for Apollonius of Tyana*, op. cit.) it is possible that Apollonius might have received a "testimony" for his merits from a certain Greek city.

a detailed analysis of VA carried out in the context of other than Philostratean sources allows us to distinguish with absolute certainty only four cities (together with the already mentioned Ephesus) where the historical Apollonius was known. He even had his own cult there.

The first of those cities was obviously his native TYANA in Cappadocia. We are absolutely certain that Apollonius had his sanctuary in Tyana. Philostratus mentions it twice in VA, but as usual he is inaccurate. In VA I 5 he writes about a ἱερόν of Apollonius erected in the meadow where Apollonius was said to have been born. In the last chapter of the biography (VIII 31) Philostratus mentions ἱερά of Apollonius in Tyana which was apparently visited by the emperor's officials and even by the emperors themselves. Bowie suggests that what is mentioned here is Apollonius' statues placed in his ἱερόν⁹. However, in VA VIII 29 Philostratus writes about Apollonius' effigies in the temple of Tyana, calling them εἰκόνες. It is possible then that when Philostratus refers to ἱερά of Apollonius in the last chapter of the biography, he means several sanctuaries of Apollonius in Tyana. It appears highly probable in the light of information supplied by Cassius Dio. He writes that the emperor Caracalla built a ἡρώον for Apollonius in Tyana¹⁰. Thus it seems that Caracalla turned the already existing sanctuary into a sumptuous heroum to commemorate the hero whom he admired and praised for his magical and healing skills¹¹. It follows that the cult of Apollonius existed in Tyana in the times prior to Caracalla.

⁹ Bowie, op. cit., p. 1688 note 141; Jones (*An Epigram on Apollonius of Tyana*, op. cit., p. 193 note 36) thinks that what is described here is the sanctuaries in the plural built for Apollonius by "kings".

¹⁰ LXXVII, 18.4.

¹¹ If Philostratus writing about εἰκόνες of Apollonius in VA VIII 29 refers to certain pictures or paintings with his likenesses, then Bowie's argument on Apollonius' ἱερά in VA VIII 31 is justifiable.

However, other assumptions are also possible. In VA I 5 Philostratus writes that according to a local legend Apollonius was regarded as a son of Zeus Asbameus in Tyana. A similar piece of information is contained in Ammianus Marcellinus' *History*. He writes that Apollonius was born in the vicinity of Jupiter Asbameus' temple in Tyana¹². This temple was situated near a sacred lake and a spring of Asbameus. So should we perhaps assume, following Schütz's views¹³, that this temple also contained a cult statue of Apollonius who was acknowledged as a son of Zeus — the god who was worshipped there? Moreover, Schütz holds that the meadow which, according to Philostratus, was the scene of Apollonius' birth and where his sanctuary was erected, was devoted to Apollo. It was also this god to whom Apollonius owed his name. Schütz claims that the cult of Apollonius merged with the cult of Apollo which had existed in Tyana for a long time¹⁴.

In VA VIII 31 Philostratus admits that he did not meet anywhere either the tomb or the cenotaph of Apollonius. So he knows only his *ἱερόν* or *ἱερά*, and *εἰκόνες* situated there¹⁵. By keeping the problem of Apollonius' tomb in the dark, Philostratus seems to persuade us that nobody was interested in the place of Apollonius' burial since he was not an ordinary mortal. Recognized as a hero, Apollonius was half-divine (Philostratus even goes so far as to describe his ascension, VIII 30), and as such he was commemorated with a sanctuary, with statues or effigies mirroring his immortal nature¹⁶.

¹² XXIII, 19.

¹³ *Beiträge zur Formgeschichte synoptischer Wundererzählungen*, op. cit., pp. 56-58.

¹⁴ In medieval Latin texts Apollonius is called Apollo: qui vocatus est Apollo; qui et Apollo dicitur (Weisser, op. cit., p. 6).

¹⁵ Only Jones (op. cit., pp. 192-93) tries to prove that Apollonius' tomb was in Tyana, forming his opinion on the basis of the Adana inscription.

¹⁶ The first preserved effigy of Apollonius goes back probably to the Severi's

The cult of Apollonius in Tyana is also recorded by later sources. A late antique pseudoepigraph (which originated not earlier than in the fifth century A.D.) entitled *Book of Wisdom of Apollonius of Tyana* mentions a temple (ναός) of Apollonius in Tyana embellished with a gold pillar (χρυσοῦν στῦλον)¹⁷. The author of the pseudoepigraph writes that the temple was the object of adoration expressed by "all people".

In the life of Aurelian contained in *Historia Augusta* we read that Aurelian, who laid siege to Tyana during his march against Palmyra, there saw Apollonius in the shape which he knew from his effigies in numerous temples¹⁸, among which was probably also the temple at Tyana. Apollonius asked the emperor not to destroy his native city. Aurelian granted his request and in order to show his consideration for the sage, he decided to erect an effigy, statues, and a temple (*imaginem et statuas et templum*).

It is possible that the pillar mentioned in the late antique pseudoepigraph was remembered by an anonymous Byzantine writer of the twelfth century who wrote about many statues and pillars brought to Constantinople from various Greek cities by Constantine the Great. Besides others, he mentions the pillar from Tyana¹⁹. John Tzetzes, while summarizing Philostratus' VA in his *Chiliades* interposes a piece of information which he derived from other sources

times (S. SETTIS, *Severo Alessandro e i Suoi Lari*, *Athenaeum* 50, 1972, p. 237). On the cult of the heroes cf. P. BROWN, *The Cult of the Saints: Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity* (The Harshell Lectures on History of Religious, New Series, No 2, ed. J.M. Kitagawa) Chicago 1981, p. 10 ff; S. EITREM, *Heros*, *RE* 8,15, 1912, col. 1119-45; A.D. NOCK, *The Cult of Heroes*, *Harvard Theological Review* 37, 1944, pp. 141-74 = *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, II, Oxford 1972, pp. 575-602.

¹⁷ F. BOLL, *Catalogus Codicum Astrologorum Graecorum* VII, Bruxelles 1908, p. 176, 25, see chapter III, p. 103 f.

¹⁸ V. *Aureliani* XXIV, 2-6.

¹⁹ *Patria Cpleos* II 73, p. 189 Preger.

than the Philostratean ones. He claims that Apollonius' miraculous deeds were written down and preserved in Tyana²⁰. So maybe they were placed in Apollonius' temple which was still remembered in the twelfth century, in the times of Tzetzes?

Caracalla built heroum in Tyana probably in 215 A.D. when he visited this city during his expedition to the East. He was accompanied by Cassius Dio and probably even by Philostratus himself (VA VIII 31)²¹. Thanks to Cassius Dio we know that Caracalla was partial to magicians and charlatans and admired the heroes of the Trojan War²². Philostratus' *Heroicos* was written thanks to his commission²³. In Apollonius the magician he probably found a more contemporary hero who corresponded to the spirit of his time.

We do not have intimate knowledge of the character of Apollonius' cult in his native city. Yet on the analogy of neighbouring Cilicia where in Aegaeae Apollonius was worshipped as a magician and healer, we may expect that also his cult in Tyana was of a similar character²⁴. Cassius Dio writes that in 200 A.D. Plautianus, Septimius Severus' friend, fell ill in Tyana²⁵. The fact that he fell ill in the native city of the healer and the priest of Asclepios known in Cilicia confirms our assumption as far as the character of Apollonius' cult goes. Plautianus was likely to approach the magician and physician worshipped as a hero there, and to ask him for his medical advice. In 215 A.D.

²⁰ Chil. II, 973.

²¹ Bowersock, *Greek Sophists*, op. cit., p. 5; Cary (in) *Dio's Roman History*, op. cit., p. IX; L. ROBERT, *De Cilicie à Messine et à Plymouth*, op. cit., p. 195 f.

²² His visit to Achilles' tomb is described by Cassius Dio (LXXVIII, 16.7) and Herodian (*Ab excessu divi Marci* IV, 8.3-5).

²³ Mantero, *Ricerche sull'Heroicos*, op. cit. p. 11 f.

²⁴ On Apollonius' relationship with Asclepios in Aegaeae see below p. 63.

²⁵ LXXXVI, 15.4.

on his way to the East Caracalla visited Asclepios' sanctuaries in Asia Minor, because he suffered from a certain undetermined illness²⁶. Is it not possible then that he found relief in Tyana thanks to Apollonius and consequently built his heroum?

Only Arabic sources tell us that Apollonius' talismans were in use also in Tyana. They are mentioned in the work entitled *On the Talismans placed by Apollonius in his Native City Tyana and in Other Cities of the Empire*²⁷. According to the same tradition Apollonius discovered *The Book of the Mystery of Creation* and the Emerald slab in Tyana, both of which were the source of Arabic alchemic knowledge. Apparently, he found those precious objects buried under the statue of Hermes Trismegistos in Tyana²⁸.

We should also notice that Tyana was the native city of one of Apollonius' pupils whose lively and malicious portrait was provided by Lucian in his *Alexander*; the portrait which will be dealt with more thoroughly in the next chapter.

While discussing the cult of Apollonius in his native Tyana it may be worth adding that the sources up to the Arabic times²⁹ termed Apollonius the Tyanean. He reveals his personal attitude towards this city in his letters addressed to his brother Hestiaeus (Epp. Apoll. 44). The letter reports that the citizens of Tyana accused Apollonius of weakening his ties with his native Tyana. This was said to have its roots in his cosmopolitan way of life. Apollonius answers this accusation in a way which might have been easily chosen by Seneca, Epictetus, Dio Chrysostom or Marcus

²⁶ L. ROBERT, *De Cilicie à Messine*, op. cit., p. 190 and note 158.

²⁷ KRAUS, JABIR IBN HAYYĀN, op. cit., p. 293, Weisser, op. cit., p. 24.

²⁸ KRAUS, op. cit., pp. 273-78.

²⁹ Jones, op. cit., p. 192 and note 13.

Aurelius³⁰. He praises his country, he serves it and aims to glorify it by means of his activities. At the same time, however, he thinks that as a man he belongs to the whole world, that the whole earth is his native country and all people are his brothers (be they Greek or barbarian). It is because the World-State, he argues, is created by a god and is governed by one common law, the law of Nature. It is inherent in the human mind so each man can abide by it. This double notion of the state and the native country, so characteristic of Stoic and Cynic thought of the first and second centuries A.D.³¹, in our view places this letter in the oldest part of the epistolary collection of Apollonius. These remarks prove that already in the pre-Philostratean times Apollonius was strongly attached to Tyana and was known as an outstanding citizen of this city.

Epp. Apoll. 44 is likely to have given rise to the next letter which reverts to the same problems (Epp. Apoll. 47). Here also Apollonius explains away his attitude towards Tyana and, as in his previous letter, he justifies the aim of his travels to the council and citizen of his native city. He stresses that they should remember that his voyages have a moral aim and add glory to Tyana itself. Other letters tell us that he took care of his fellow-citizens and supplied them with funds (Epp. Apoll. 35; 45; 48; 49; 72; 73).

As we know Philostratus' work was finished around 220 A.D. when heroum in Tyana had already been built on the site of an old sanctuary erected by the citizens of Tyana

³⁰ Cf. Seneca, *Ad Ser. de Otio* IV 31, 1; *Epist.* III, 28.4; Epictetus, *Diatr.* II 5, 26; 10.2; III, 24.10; Dio Chrysostomus, *Or.* I 42; XXXVI 20; 31; Marcus Aurelius, *Med.* III 11; VI 44.

³¹ Cf. M. JÓZEFOWICZ - DZIĘLSKA, *W. Kregu teoretyczno-ustrojowych zagadnień filozofii stoicko-cynickiej pierwszych dwu wieków cesarstwa rzymskiego*, *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego CCCLXIV, Prace Historyczne* z. 50, 1974, pp. 7-30.

to their benefactor Apollonius. It is highly probable that Philostratus visited the place. If he did, then he acquired a tangible proof of reverence paid to his “divine man”.

AEgaeae in Cilicia is the next city undoubtedly connected with the historical Apollonius. As we remember Maximus of Aegaeae chose this city as the place of Apollonius’ studies and medical practice. The historicity of Maximus and of his work cannot be questioned. However, we know that Philostratus considerably distorted its content. What appears to be conspicuous in the secular tradition of Apollonius is the “Asclepeian” aspect of his activities. As we are trying to demonstrate in the present work, his magic was always linked to his — broadly understood — beneficial and healing activities.

The Aegaeae temple where Apollonius was active is mentioned in various sources. It was one of the most important centres of Asclepios’ cult and healing³². While reading Maximus’ text incorporated in Philostratus’ work we learn that Apollonius employed healing methods typical of Asclepeian art there: incubations, and prayers (I 9; 10), and that he had recourse to natural remedies such as diet (I 8) and clearing the bowels (I 9). The same temple, “in the times” of Apollonius was the scene of Asclepios’ restorative epiphanies (I 8; 10)³³. As a healer, Apollonius dealt with moral troubles of his patients as well (I 10; 12), thus following a generally accepted rule pertaining to the cult of Asclepios that whoever entered the sanctuary of this god was to be pure in his soul (I 11)³⁴.

³² E.J. and L. EDELSTEIN, *Asclepius, A Collection and Interpretation of the Testimonies* I, Baltimore 1944, pp. 387; 418-21; L. ROBERT, *De Cilicie à Messine*, op. cit., pp. 185-97 collects all the sources on the sanctuary of Asclepios in Aegaeae; A. WALLON, *Asclepius, The Cult of the Greek God of Medicine*, Ithaca 1894 (rep. Chicago 1979, p. 116).

³³ LO CASCIO, op. cit., pp. 53-63; Ferguson, *The Religions of the Roman Empire*, op. cit., p. 111.

³⁴ Ferguson, op. cit., p. 110.

If we are to trust Philostratus Maximus wrote also that Apollonius resorted to magic in his medical practice. He refers to Apollonius' secret skill of prophesying illnesses and of recognizing their causes (I 10)³⁵. In that way, using both medical knowledge and magic, he managed to cure a case of dropsy, he revealed the cause of illness of an infamous Cilician man of means, brought to light treacherous intrigues, disgraceful for a patient of Asclepios, carried on by the governor of Cilicia, and he effected many cures (I 9-12).

Besides, Apollonius devoted one of his letters to his "service" to Asclepios (Epp. Apoll. 23). Here Apollonius explains why he became the priest of Asclepios. It was because his master Pythagoras treated medicine in the same way as Asclepios did. He considered it a divine art and demanded that physicians should cure both souls and bodies. Young Apollonius underwent his final conversion to Pythagoreanism in Aegaeae itself (I 7)³⁶. Some arguments lead us to believe that this letter is a pre-Philostratean fabrication or even that it was written by Apollonius himself. It concentrates on Apollonius' Pythagoreanism in connection with the cult of Asclepios and it has its historical addressee : T. Statilius Crito, a physician of the Emperor Trajan³⁷. Our association is simple. A consolatory letter addressed to Valerius, most probably written by Apollonius himself or by someone who knew his views well, originated also in Trajan's times.

In one of the letters directed to Euphrates (Epp. Apoll. 8) we find similar views as in Epp. Apoll. 23. Apollonius explains to Euphrates that it is Pythagoreanism which makes him cure people and relieve their sufferings. In the light of the above sources, Maximus' remark that Apollonius

³⁵ Also Bowie points it out, *op. cit.*, p. 1684.

³⁶ See chapter IV, p. 143.

³⁷ Cf. Penella, *op. cit.*, pp. 103-4.

was a "servant to, and an associate of, Asclepios"; θεράπων τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ καὶ ἑταῖρος (VA I 12) appears to be understandable. Maximus adds that Apollonius' medical talents were famous in the whole of Cilicia. This gave rise to a proverb: Whither runnest thou? Is it to see the stripling? (I 8). It clearly follows that Aegaeae was the destination of pilgrimages undertaken by sufferers seeking the help of a young student of Asclepios' art.

In the autumn of 215 A.D. Caracalla who, as we remember, worshipped Apollonius and had just erected his sanctuary at Tyana, came to Aegaeae³⁸ to inquire into the cause of his illness. Perhaps he also wanted to ensure help of the magician and physician held in esteem there, in whose powers he had believed already in Tyana!

In VA Philostratus attributed to Apollonius many miraculous cures, he considerably expanded the Asclepeian plot which he had derived from Maximus, and he made Apollonius visit various Asclepeia besides Aegaeae: that at Pergamum (IV 11), Epidauros (IV 18), and at Leben in Crete (IV 34). However, none of the documents which originated in those places mentions this priest and lover of Asclepios. The discoveries made in recent years only confirm the historicity of Apollonius' connection with Cilicia, and more particularly, as it seems, with Aegaeae itself. An inscription found among the stones in Adana Museum contains, as we have already mentioned in the Introduction, an epigram on Apollonius.

Below I quote its content after Dagron and Marcillet-Jaubert³⁹: /Οὔτος/ Ἀπόλλωνος μὲν ἐπώνυμος, ἐκ Τυάνων δ' ἐλάμψας ἀνθρώπων ἔσβεσεν ἀμπλακίας. /— υῦ/ φος Τυάνων τόδ' ἐτήτυμον, Οὐρανὸς αὐτὸν /πέμψεν ὅπως θνητῶν ἐξελάσιε πόνους.

³⁸ Robert, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

³⁹ Türk Tarih Kurumu Belleten, *op. cit.*, p. 402; also J. and L. Robert in Bulletin Épigraphique, *op. cit.*, quotes this text.

The word in the third line of the epigram can be hardly deciphered due to a partial destruction of the stone. The interpretation of the first word in the fourth line is also highly dubious. Suggestions put forward by scholars as regards the actual reading of the lacking word vary. Dagron and Marcillet-Jaubert proposed to introduce into the third line: βρέφος Τυάνων and into the fourth one: πέμψεν ὅπως⁴⁰. Bowie suggest: γαῖα τάφος Τυανῶν, and in the next: δέξαθ' ὅπως⁴¹. Jones criticizes Dagron and Marcillet-Jaubert's proposal and introduces into the third line: σῶμα τάφος⁴², whereas he agrees with Bowie as far as the next line goes⁴³. R. Merkelbach claims that first it should be: ἦν δὲ βρέφος Τυάνων and then in the fourth line: τέχθη, ὅπως....

Recently two new suggestions have been brought out: N.J. Richardson and P. Burian propose: γαῖα τροφὸς Τυάνων (3), and γείναθ' ὅπως (4)⁴⁴, and Peek reads the last couplet thus: /φῆ δὲ σο/φὸς Τυάνων τόδ' ἐτήτυμον, "οὐρανὸς αὐτον /πέμψεν, ὅ/πως θνητῶν ἐξελάσει πόνους"⁴⁵.

None of the above suggestions can be treated as final. That is why only the first part of the epigram is fully understandable. Here Apollonius is compared to Apollo. He has his name after the god Apollo and he "shines forth from Tyana". It remains in agreement with the view

⁴⁰ Loc. cit.

⁴¹ Op. cit., p. 1688.

⁴² *An Epigram on Apollonius*, op. cit., p. 191. Thanks to the courtesy of N.J. RICHARDSON, I know Jones's another rectification which he intends to publish in the supplement to the above essay. Here he suggests μνήμ' ὅτ' σῶμ' ἔδαφος Τυάνων.

⁴³ *Das Epigram auf Apollonius von Tyana*, Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphie 41, 1981, p. 270.

⁴⁴ *The Epigram of Apollonius of Tyana*, Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 22, 3, 1981, p. 284.

⁴⁵ *Epigramm auf Apollonius von Tyana*, op. cit., p. 298.

presented above which connects Apollonius with Apollo worshipped in a definite place, that is in Tyana (the sacred meadow). Apollonius' activity was beneficial because he "undid (or more precisely: extinguished) the faults of men". Suggestions put forward as regards the content of the first line in the second couplet are so numerous that they render the elucidation of the actual message impossible. Personally, I incline to those offered by Dagron and Marcillet-Jaubert or by Richardson and Burian. The solutions claiming that Apollonius' tomb was in Tyana (Bowie, Jones)⁴⁶ I consider fallacious. As we have already written it is not only Philostratus who keeps silent about Apollonius' tomb or cenotaph at Tyana; none of all the available sources and materials bring forth any information on this matter.

As far as the second line of the second couplet is concerned, I agree with those interpretations which explain that "heaven sent him" or that "heaven begot him" so that he could "drive out the pains of men" (Dagron and Marcillet-Jaubert, Merkelbach, Richardson and Burian, Peek). This interpretation finds its corroboration in the available sources. They include Philostratus, in spite of the fact that Jones⁴⁷ refers to him when he argues that Apollonius was "received by heaven" and from there beneficially assisted the sufferers. It is true that following a certain tradition Philostratus describes Apollonius' ascension in the temple of Dictynna in Crete (VIII 30); yet he also writes about the "heaven" which announced Apollonius. His birth was apparently preceded by the revelation of the god Proteus to his mother (I 4), who prophesied her that she would give birth to Apollonius himself. In VA I 6 Philostratus reports the view prevalent in Tyana during Apollonius' lifetime that he was a son of Zeus. So it was already then

⁴⁶ Cf. Jones' explanation (op. cit., p. 192).

⁴⁷ Ibid.

that he was said to have been "sent" or "begot" by heaven. People deemed him to be a hero and consequently they built his heroum after his death. Elsewhere Philostratus writes that people regarded Apollonius as a demon (I 19) or as god (IV 31). This opinion appears in the letters too. We already know Apollonius' letter to his brother Hestiaeus (Epp. Apoll. 44) which makes it clear that Apollonius was considered the equal to gods, or even that some thought him to be a god himself. In Epp. Apoll. 48 Apollonius admits that gods often talked about him, both in their personal oracles and publicly, and that his nature resembled that of the gods (θεῖος ἄνθρωπος).

The content of this letter remains in an interesting connection with the second couplet of the epigram, as reconstructed by Peek. We remember that he interprets this couplet as an oracle announcing that Apollonius was sent by heaven so that he could pursue his beneficial and humane activities on the earth.

The fact that Apollonius was treated as a superhuman being begotten by heaven was also mentioned by a well-known orator and defender of Hellenism, Eunapius of Sardis. He claimed that Philostratus should have entitled his work *A Visit of God to Mankind* (ἐπιδημία εἰς ἀνθρώπους θεοῦ)⁴⁸, instead of *The Life of Apollonius*. Eunapius adds that worshippers of Apollonius thought that he had his human frame and shape only for the sake of appearance⁴⁹, whereas in fact he was a god or rather an intermediate being: half-god and half-human: τι θεῶν τε καὶ ἀνθρώπου μέσον.

The usage of the verb ἐξελαύνειν (θυητῶν ἐξελάσει πόνους) in the last line of the epigram also makes us believe that the author had in mind only the tangible earthly ac-

⁴⁸ *Vitae Philosoph. et. Sophist.*, p. 347 Wright.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 543 Wright.

tivity of Apollonius “begotten by heaven”⁵⁰. It has been already pointed out that Tzetzes used the same verb when he described beneficial effects of Apollonius’ talismanic activities in Byzantium.⁵¹ So we may assume that the author of the epigram (which, as we shall prove below, originated in the first half of the fourth century) resorted to this verb for the same reason. If we accept it then Bowie’s and Jones’ interpretation will become understandable and will find its usefulness. It is because we assume that the author of the epigram thought about the posthumous diffusion of Apollonius’ talismans in some of the Greek cities in the East: above all in Antioch and Byzantium⁵². If it was so, then he had the grounds for assuming that they were the effect of the posthumous, “coming from heaven” activity of the sage and magician, undertaken for the benefit of suffering people. In the aforementioned cities Apollonius was known as a deviser of talismans protecting people against various nasty plagues. However, this information is contained in relatively late sources, the earliest of which (Eusebius of Caesarea) dates back to the beginning of the fourth century. So our hypothesis is based on dubious data. A most probable version appears to be very simple. The author of the epigram used the verb ἐξελαύνειν in a different meaning than Tzetzes; he still did not know Apollonius’ talismans and wrote only about the humane Asclepeian and moralizing activities of the sage for the benefit of the suffering. This seems to be manifest, the more so as the above verb used by Tzetzes to describe beneficial effects of Apollonius’ talismans made against plagues and natural disasters was also used in a strictly medical sense.

⁵⁰ The usage of this verb in the sources on Apollonius was analysed by Richardson and Burian (op. cit., p. 284 and note 3).

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Cf. chapter III, p. 105 ff.

In one of the Ephesian inscriptions containing a hymn to Asclepios we find such a statement: τηλόσε δαῖμον ἔλαυ/νε/ νούσων τᾶγρια φῦλα⁵³. The said verb applies here to physical illnesses, so it may be used in the same meaning in our epigram. After all, it appears along with the noun πόνος which denotes illnesses and physical pains⁵⁴.

The citizens of Ephesus, who called Apollonius for help during the pestilence, asked him to act as a physician of their misfortune: ἱατρὸν ποιούμενοι αὐτὸν τοῦ πάθους (VA IV 10). In the already mentioned letter to Euphrates (Epp. Apoll. 8) Apollonius labels himself almost in the same way as the epigrammatist. As a Pythagorean and follower of Asclepios he puts an end to people's troubles and alleviates their pains. (καὶ σωμάτων δὲ ὀδύνας ἀφαιρεῖ καὶ πάθη παύει).

Undoubtedly then, the reason why the epigrammatist emphasized a genetic relationship between Apollonius and Apollo was that he had also in mind strong links between Apollonius and a son of Apollo - Asclepios. The whole epigram confirms this assumption: its author writes that Apollonius "drove out the pains of men" and earlier that he "extinguished their faults". After all, we remember that in Aegaeae Apollonius not only cured his patients but also educated and reproached them for their faults and even for their crimes (I 12). Jones holds that when the epigrammatist writes about Apollonius' improving moral errors he means for instance Apollonius' correction of his brother's vices (I 13)⁵⁵. Yet I am sure that what is really meant here is Apollonius' medical activity. The epigrammatist knew various sides of this activity: a purely medical one and that

⁵³ *Die Inschriften von Ephesos*, Teil Iv, 1253, 6-7, Bonn 1980.

⁵⁴ Cf. Jones' philological commentary, op. cit., p. 193.

⁵⁵ Op. cit., p. 191.

which healed the souls. Thus he might also have known that Apollonius was a Pythagorean, and that is why he put a special emphasis on Apollonius' interest in the soul and in human character. Moreover, when he wrote about Apollonius' relationship with Apollo he might have referred to the legend that made Pythagoras a son of Apollo and Pythais⁵⁶.

In the light of the above considerations, the inscription tells us about a wise doctor (and possibly a magician, too) who bore Apollo's name and was sent to the earth in order to deliver people from pains and faults by means of his medical help, advice and instruction, of his gestures and maybe also of a magical object. The connection between the content of the epigram and the description of Apollonius' Asclepeian activity in Aegaeae rendered by Philostratus (who followed Maximus) seems to be irrefutable. Its breeding-ground was probably Aegaeae.

Dagron and Marcillet-Jaubert as well as J. and L. Robert suggest that the stone with the epigram comes from Aegaeae⁵⁷; Merkelbach thinks it absolutely certain⁵⁸. Jones believes that it comes unquestionably from eastern Cilicia Pedias. Apart from Aegaeae Jones takes into account Tarsus as a probable place of its origin⁵⁹. The epigram sets up strong genetic links between Apollonius and Tyana. There is nothing strange or new in that, since all the available sources and pieces of information on Apollonius emphasize his Tyanean origin. So it might suggest that the stone was moved from Tyana to Adana. However, Bowie had already proved that the carrying of the stone across the Taurus Mountains to Adana was hardly possible⁶⁰.

⁵⁶ Levy, *La Légende de Pythagore de Grèce en Palestine*, Paris 1927, p. 8.

⁵⁷ Türk Tarih Kurumu Belleten, op. cit., p. 404; Bull. Epigr., op. cit.

⁵⁸ Op. cit., p. 270.

⁵⁹ Op. cit., p. 191.

⁶⁰ Op. cit., p. 1688.

There are no doubts that the inscription was cut in Cilicia. Apollonius' links with this region were as strong as with Cappadocia. It was in Cilicia that Apollonius served Asclepios and where the proverb connected with this activity was coined. Here also originated the rumour about Apollonius' only love story. In the life of Alexander Peloplaton contained in VS, Philostratus writes that the exceptionally beautiful mother of the sophist Alexander Peloplaton of Seleucia fell in love with Apollonius and she did not make a secret of their relation. She turned down other candidates and chose him because she wanted to have an offspring with the man who had more divinity in him than other mortals⁶¹.

In VA Maximus says that Apollonius spent six years in Cilicia. Yet we assume that he stayed much longer and returned several times there. After all, in his lifetime Apollonius roamed almost solely through eastern Asia Minor and northern Syria.

In the light of the above arguments and hypotheses it seems very probable that the stone comes from Aegaeae, and not, as Jones suggests, from Tarsus. Although in the first century A.D. there were strong links between Tarsus and Aegaeae⁶², Apollonius emphasized the individuality of the latter quite decisively. He did not like Tarsus and its corrupt and indolent citizens (VA I 7). He even began his philosophical studies in that city, but soon moved to Aegaeae where he found not only the peace, so desirable for someone who wants to become a philosopher, and studies of high standard, but also the temple of Asclepios where the god used to appear to people. Moreover, there was a centre of sophistic and philosophical studies attached to

⁶¹ VS II 5; Penella, *op. cit.*, pp. 105-6.

⁶² E.J. BICKERMANN, *Syria and Cilicia*, *American Journal of Philology* 68, 1947, p. 355.

the temple where, as we know, an interesting sophist Antioch of Aegaeae, and our pre-Philostratean biographer of Apollonius Maximus were educated⁶³.

Philostratus claims that despite Apollonius' aversion to Tarsus he visited this city twice and always reproached its citizens for their indolence and predilection for sensual pleasure (VI 34; VI 43). Philostratus writes that Apollonius effected a miraculous cure at Tarsus only once (VI 43). Namely, he cured a boy bitten by a rabid dog using his medical knowledge and a Pythagorean doctrine of transmigration of souls. Yet Philostratus does not report any story on Apollonius' activities at Asclepeion at Tarsus, neither does he claim Apollonius' merits as a doctor there. Besides, according to Philostratus, Tarsus was not the only city where Apollonius educated and admonished people. Apollonius, who began to combat men's vices in Aegaeae, continued this activity, as Philostratus claims, in almost all Greek cities. He aimed his exhortations at particular citizens, at emperors and at their officials. As we have already written Philostratus holds that it was Apollonius' every-day moralizing activity. However, we know that Apollonius acted in that way only in Aegaeae. Moreover, we may assume that he might have expressed his views on moral issues also in Antioch and in other cities which he visited. Apart from that, Apollonius' public activity, so extensively dealt with by Philostratus, is only a literary figment of the latter's imagination.

As we remember, Philostratus writes that the Tarsians, grateful to Apollonius for his pieces of advice, acknowledged him to be the second founder of their city and its first citizen. Jones assumes that this information might suggest that they placed an epigram praising his virtues somewhere in a public place. Yet we have already mentioned that

⁶³ Bowersock, *Greek Sophists*, op. cit., p. 19-20.

Philostratus also described the distinctions bestowed on the sage by the Spartans who granted citizenship to him, called him their father and who were prepared to worship him as a god (IV 31). But nobody believes that Apollonius was an instigator of reforms at Sparta in the first century⁶⁴. Likewise, it is difficult to believe in the honours he allegedly received at Tarsus. Tarsus remains a theoretical place of origin of our inscription only because it was the second city in Cilicia to which Maximus of Aegaeae linked Apollonius and because it was situated nearer Adana than Aegaeae. What I am inclined to think is only that Apollonius visited Tarsus when he wandered through the part of Cilicia where this city was situated. But I cannot accept that the epigram which we analyse here comes from Tarsus. Apart from some pieces of misleading information supplied by Philostratus, we do not have any other substantial data on Apollonius' links with Tarsus.

The block with the inscription served as an architrave or a lintel. Apollonius' statue might have been placed underneath⁶⁵. Presumably it belonged to a certain edifice (a shrine?) which, in turn, was a part of the temple of the god Asclepios in Aegaeae. It is quite possible that as a token of their grateful memory the citizens of Aegaeae built a small sanctuary for Apollonius in the vicinity of the Asclepeion. The epigram itself is dated variously. As I have already mentioned, this problem will be discussed in chapter V of the present work.

ANTIOCH on the Orontes River is probably the third city of Apollonius' cult and above all, as a long tradition had it, of his visits there.

⁶⁴ However, K.M.T. CHRIMES believes it, *Ancient Sparta, a Reexamination of the Evidence*, Manchester 1949, pp. 158-61.

⁶⁵ Dagron and Marcillet-Jaubert, *op. cit.*, p. 402; Jones, *op. cit.* p. 190 and 193.

Philostratus might have personally heard the oral tradition of Apollonius which existed in that city. His statement (VA I 2) that in his biographical work he utilized stories about Apollonius preserved in various cities, is at least probable in the case of Antioch. After all, he stayed at that city together with Julia Domna in 217 A.D., that is just before her suicide⁶⁶. He was likely to have learned about Apollonius' prophecies and to have visited the places of his cult.

Our opinion on Apollonius cult in Antioch can only be conjectural. However, it is corroborated by information provided by Pseudo-Justin in his *Quaestiones et Responsiones ad Orthodoxos*⁶⁷. Here we read that a god threw down Apollonius' statue which had been chosen by a demon to announce his oracles and to encourage people to worship Apollonius as a god.

According to the latest studies Pseudo-Justin's apologetic work originated in the Antiochian school, probably at the beginning of the fifth century. Either Theodoret of Cyrus or another apologist of the same school might have been its author⁶⁸. However, at the same time the author points out that the god did allow men to use Apollonius' talismans. It was because Apollonius made them for the benefit of people without using his divine powers. This statement leads to a simple conclusion. Apollonius' talismans were so well known and popular in Antioch in the fourth and fifth centuries that the Church had to acquiesce in these pagan customs⁶⁹. However, it did not allow the cult of

⁶⁶ VS, p. 3 Wright; Bowersock, op. cit., p. 5.

⁶⁷ Theodoretus, *Quaest. et. Resp.* 24 Papadopoulos Kerameus.

⁶⁸ Cf. Speyer, op. cit., p. 56. On the Antiochian school see: *The Oxford Classical Dictionary of the Christian Church*, London 1957, pp. 63-64.

⁶⁹ In Antioch paganism competed worthily with Christianity of the late Empire, cf. Théodoret de Cyr, *Thérapeutique des Maladies Helléniques* I (Sources Chrétiennes 57), Paris 1958, pp. 11-14.

Apollonius' statue which was "inhabited" by a demon. This object of the cult is described by the author as ἄγαλμα. Usually this name denotes a cult statue, bearing an air of sanctity, rather than an ordinary effigy (εἰκὼν) granted to a meritorious person ⁷⁰.

Also Cedrenos mentions Apollonius' statue in Antioch; together with Pseudo-Justin he holds that the statue was the abode of a demon (here this statue is called μνῆμα) ⁷¹. He derives this information from Anastasius Sinaita, a monk of the seventh century ⁷².

In the fourth and fifth centuries Apollonius was well-known in Antioch. He was a familiar figure both to pagan intellectuals and to the Fathers of the Antiochian Church. We will write about this in the next chapter too. Suffice it to mention here that the Antiochian priest St. John Chrysostom stigmatized him in his homilies by calling him: ἁπατεὼν ἐκεῖνος καὶ γόης ⁷³.

According to Philostratus, Apollonius visited Antioch several times. There he criticized its citizens for their predilection for sensual pleasure (I 16) and their impudence (III 58). He also prophesied an earthquake as a punishment for their vices (VI 38). Condemning their sybaritism Apollonius concentrated on the pleasures of the hot bath which they took at the public baths. What Philostratus means here is probably the baths built by Domitian and situated near the amphitheatre of Gaius Julius Caesar and the temple of Aphrodite (they were called Τὸ Δομετιανόν) ⁷⁴.

⁷⁰ Cf. JONES, *The Roman World of Dio Chrysostom*, op. cit. p. 29 and note 26; p. 105 and note 5.

⁷¹ Op. cit., p. 432 Bonn.

⁷² See Speyer, op. cit., pp. 60-61. O. WEINREICH, *Antike Heilungswunder, Untersuchungen zum Wunderglauben der Griechen und Römer* (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten), Gissen 1906, p. 162.

⁷³ *De Laudibus Sancti Pauli Apostoli* 4 (PG 50, col. 450).

⁷⁴ G. DOWNEY, *A History of Antioch in Syria*, Princeton 1961, p. 207-8.

Indeed, Apollonius might have visited Antioch in Domitian's times (as he visited Ephesus) and by condemning the pleasures sought after by the Antiochians in the baths built by this emperor, he might have been expressing his hatred for this tyrant. It agrees with what we already know about Apollonius' historically valid antipathy towards Domitian. Besides, this theory is also likely because the late Antiochian tradition connects Apollonius' visit to this city with the times of Domitian.

An Antiochian historian Malalas writes that a well-known Pythagorean philosopher and wonder-worker Apollonius of Tyana visited Antioch in Domitian's time⁷⁵. He claims that after his stay in Byzantium, Apollonius went to Antioch in Syria. Members of the city council asked him to make the most necessary talismans for the city. At their request Apollonius contrived a talisman protecting them against the north wind - it was placed on the eastern gate. In the centre of the city he built a talisman to protect them against scorpions (a bronze scorpion on a small pillar). Thanks to its power he could drive all the scorpions out of the city. Moreover, the Antiochians asked him to make a talisman to keep off mosquitoes because they were especially plagued by them. Granting this request Apollonius set up an annual magic ceremony at which the citizens were to wave small wands with an effigy of the god Ares at their end and to chant incantations against the mosquitoes. Furthermore, local notables showed him a place where a magical pillar against the earthquakes — later destroyed by fire — used to stand. It was built by the seer Debborius in Caesar's time. They asked Apollonius to restore it and to make a proper talisman. Yet he hesitated to make it; instead he took a tablet in his hands and wrote down on

⁷⁵ *Op. cit.*, pp. 263-66 Bonn.

it words full of sorrow for Antioch which soon could expect earthquakes and fires.

Malalas' information appears to be highly reliable. After all, he utilized the works of former Antiochian historians and quoted *acta urbis* as his source⁷⁶.

Cedrenos accords with Malalas as regards Apollonius' visit to Antioch⁷⁷. Also Tzetzes mentions Apollonius' prophecies on earthquakes in Antioch. He writes briefly: Οὗτος προεῖπε καὶ σεισμὸν Ἀντιοχείας πόλει⁷⁸.

An Arabic work entitled *The Great Book of Talismans Addressed by Balīnās to his Son Aštūmūn* tells us that Apollonius (called Balīnās in Arabic), being prosecuted by a king (probably Domitian), came from Tyre to Antioch. At its citizens' request he curbed a demon who terrorized the people, he regulated the course of the Orontes River and built a talisman protecting against bed-bugs and mice there⁷⁹.

Considering the continuity of tradition from Philostratus through Malalas to the Arabic and late Byzantine times we may conclude that Philostratus utilized authentic accounts about Apollonius' visit to Antioch, about his prophecies as regards the earthquakes, and about his moral admonitions. These facts are always linked to Domitian's time in the aforementioned sources. Apollonius' talismans which were described by Malalas and by other sources, remain unknown to Philostratus. They appear much later in the course of the legend of Apollonius. Philostratus also does not mention Apollonius' "Asclepeion" medical practice at Antioch, since its character was quite different here. Apollonius counteracted the plagues tormenting people but

⁷⁶ Downey, op. cit., pp. 37-40; 192; 208.

⁷⁷ Op. cit., pp. 431-32 Bonn.

⁷⁸ *Chiliades* II, 950.

⁷⁹ Kraus, op. cit., pp. 293-94.

not their physical ailments. As we can see Antioch was the city linked to the historical Apollonius and played a considerable role in the making of his legend. It was here that Apollonius was likely to have met the philosopher Euphrates and to have corresponded with him. It is also possible that Euphrates was well aware of Apollonius' "populistic" fame in Antioch and that is why he patronized him.

A story from HA which we quoted in connection with Aurelian's siege of Tyana is also linked to Antioch. Aurelian, whom Apollonius had asked to spare Tyana, also in the case of Antioch appeared to be lenient⁸⁰. Probably it will not be totally beside the point to assume that a pagan author of *Historia Augusta* heard about Apollonius' cult at Antioch and about his talismans working in that city. This was because he wrote at the time when the myth of Apollonius spread to Rome⁸¹.

The fourth city which we are certain Apollonius visited in his lifetime was EPHESUS. It was the very accounts connected with this city which we analysed in chapter I that made us look for other places linked to Apollonius.

In Ephesus Apollonius was remembered as a seer and magician who understood the language of the birds. Here Apollonius was likely to have become acquainted with the prominent figure of the proconsul of Asia. Philostratus made Apollonius preach homilies condemning idleness, revels, and greed for wealth of the Ephesians (IV 2; 3; VIII 24). It was Ephesus where, according to one of the accounts, Apollonius died (VA VIII 30). This city appears also in the letters (Epp. Apoll. 32; 65-67), which contain similar arguments to Apollonius' Ephesian homilies included in VA.

In Ephesus Apollonius demonstrated not only his magical

⁸⁰ *Vita Aureliani* XXV 1.

⁸¹ Cf. chapter V, p. 174.

but also medical powers. First he foresaw a pestilence among its citizens (IV 4), and when it actually broke out, he combated it (IV 10) by killing the demon. The place where the demon had been annihilated became the site of Hercules Apotropaius' statue. As Hercules Apollonius had been worshipped for quite a long time in Ephesus, since Lactantius remembered him at the beginning of the fourth century. He wrote: ... Et adoratum esse a quibusdam sicut deum et simulacrum eius sub Herculis Alexicaci nomine constitum ab Ephesiis etiam nunc honorari ⁸². Apollonius' magical and healing powers gave rise to his cult in that city too.

The aforementioned *The Great Book of Talismans* tells us that Apollonius, while visiting various cities of Asia Minor and the Greek East, came to Ephesus as well. He put a magical figure in the centre of the city ⁸³. What is mentioned here is probably his cult statue erected in Ephesus. Following Philostratus we may assume that Apollonius paid visits also to Smyrna and to other Ionian cities. In VA Apollonius delivers several homilies at Smyrna (IV; 6-9; VIII 24), and prophesies its earthquake. He does the same also in other Ionian cities (IV 6). It is quite possible that Smyrna was particularly attractive for Apollonius as a Platonizing Pythagorean. There his appearances sometimes had a philosophical character ⁸⁴. In Epp. Apoll. 68 Apollonius foretells an earthquake to Miletus as well.

In the past E. Norden assumed that Philostratus had written the truth about Apollonius' stay at ATHENS; now Bowie frames a hypothesis that Moiragenes was an Athenian and that the letters to Euphrates were fabricated by

⁸² *Divinae Institutiones* V, 3 Brandt; Meyer (op. cit., p. 397 notes 2) holds that Lactantius repeated this information following Philostratus. Bowie holds an opposite view, op. cit., p. 1687 and nota 138.

⁸³ Kraus, op. cit., p. 295.

⁸⁴ Cf. chapter IV, p. 143.

Apollonius' followers in that city. Having in mind both these views we have to consider whether Apollonius could have been connected with Athens in his lifetime.

Norden⁸⁵ assumed that Apollonius had delivered an elevating speech there on the Athenians' sacrifices and religiousness (VA IV 19). A fragment of a speech devoted to an altar of an unknown god built by the Athenians in Athens found its place in VA VI 3 by mistake. Apollonius' speech in Athens was, according to Norden, an immediate source of St. Paul's speech delivered on the Areopagus⁸⁶. We do not know what made Norden assume that the editor of the *Acts of the Apostles* who wrote in Domitian's time, assembled much information on Apollonius' missionary and religious activity and that he knew his writings and teachings. We shall show in chapter IV that Apollonius' religious and reformatory activities were invented by Philostratus. Apollonius was neither famous for them, nor was he involved in it. His only sphere of interest which is tangible for us was magic along with moralizing and healing, prophesying and foretelling events. Thus Norden's argument is unacceptable.

Bowie studies the sources in order to reveal the authentic Moiragenes — the author of Apollonius' *Apomnèmata*. His name is incised on an Athenian sepulchral inscription of the second century contained in Plutarch's *Quaestiones Convivales*⁸⁷. Bowie amplifies on his interesting hypothesis and assumes that the letters to Euphrates might have been invented in Athens around the middle of the second century, after the death of both philosophers. It was probably there that the letters were handed over to Hadrian and

⁸⁵ *Agnostos Theos, Untersuchungen zur Formgeschichte religiöser Rede*, Leipzig-Berlin 1913, pp. 44-45.

⁸⁶ *Acta Apostolorum* 17, 23.

⁸⁷ Bowie, op. cit. pp. 1678-79.

then taken to his villa at Antium. As we know Hadrian obtained Apollonius' certain letters and the work Δόξαι Πυθαγόρου (VA VIII 20). This association of "certain" letters with the Pythagorean work indicates that those letters also must have been of a Pythagorean character. As we have already written it is just the letters to Euphrates that praise values of this philosophy⁸⁸. Furthermore, Bowie suggests that the letters criticizing Greek cities and Roman rule were probably written in Athens as well⁸⁹. He finds them in accord with tendencies prevailing in Hadrian's times.

Epp. Apoll. 62 reports that thanks to a proposal put forward by a certain Tyndares, Apollonius was granted Spartan citizenship, the right to own land and houses at Sparta, a bronze clipeus with his own effigy, and also a proper inscription praising his merits. A certain Tyndares appears in Plutarch's *Quaestiones Convivales*. As has been already pointed out, it might have been the same Tyndares who asked the synarchia to honour Apollonius⁹⁰. Was it possible then that Apollonius did stay in Athens and sent his letters to Sparta from there? Yet the same letter makes it clear that he did not visit Sparta. Therefore this question must be left unanswered. It is only possible that the historical Apollonius visited Athens, but his hypothesis is established on thin grounds⁹¹.

According to A.S. Bradford⁹² Epp. Apoll. 62 is the third, besides Pausanias and certain epigraphic inscriptions, historical proof of the existence of the synarchia at Sparta in the second century (consisting of the *gerontes* and the

⁸⁸ Ibid., pp. 1672-73; 1679.

⁸⁹ Cf. note 6 (Bowie, pp. 1680-83).

⁹⁰ Penella, op. cit., p. 122.

⁹¹ It is possible that in the light of Jones's recent studies of Epp. Apoll. 53 (op. cit.) I will have to change my view on the links between Apollonius and Athens.

⁹² *The Synarchia of Roman Sparta*, Chiron 10, 1980, pp. 424-25.

demos). So it is beyond any doubts that this letter was written in pre-Philostratean times.

What seems more plausible to me is an assumption that Apollonius' legend reached Athens about the middle of the second century and found its breeding-ground there. It was there where other letters, those which were taken to Antium, had been written, and where Moiragenes' and Maximus of Aegaeae's new works were widely read. Apollonius was likely to have become a popular figure in local schools of rhetoric and philosophy. A letter (Epp. Apoll. 62) presenting the political situation in Sparta of the second century A.D. might also have been written there. Finally, Athenian Stoic circles might have produced a letter explaining Apollonius' cosmopolitism from a point of view of this philosophy (Epp. Apoll. 44).

As far as Moiragenes' origins are concerned it seems more probable that he was active in the Greek East.⁹³ I am inclined to regard him as a Greek from Antioch simply because he described Apollonius and Euphrates mutual hostility, and a conflict between their philosophical attitudes. The meeting described by Moiragenes could have taken place only in Syria or in its neighbourhood, but surely not at Athens.

In VA Philostratus refers to Athens several times (II 23; III 13; 17; IV 17-22). Athens is also mentioned in Apollonius' letters (Epp. Apoll. 64; 70; App. 5). In Epp. Apoll. 64 Apollonius complains that the city of Solon did not invite him to improve its laws as Sparta did. Both in the letters and in VA Apollonius is critical of Athens. He censures the Athenians for their too loose behaviour during Dionysius' festivals and for their fondness for gladiatorial

⁹³ I. MILLER, *Moiragenes* 1 (in) RE 15, 2, col. 2497; D. GHEZZI, *Apollonio di Tiana nella Storia e Leggenda*, Rivista storico-critica delle Scienze teologiche VI, fasc. 5, pp. 381-82.

shows (VA IV 21-22). In IV 22 Philostratus quotes also the words from Apollonius' letter to the Athenians, where Apollonius refuses an invitation offered to him by the Athenian council ⁹⁴. It had its roots in his rancour against this city.

On the basis of the analysis of the sources presenting Apollonius' links with the Greek cities I seem to have revealed the reason for silence over Apollonius kept by his contemporary Roman authors. As it appears, his activity was confined only to a few cities. He never visited the capital of the Empire and never reached Baetica in Spain (VA V 7-10). He was not heard of there. In the perspective of the whole Empire he was imperceptible. He was simply one of many magicians active in the East and in Greek cities. His philosophy did not attract particular attention. After all, it was condemned by Euphrates and by certain Epicureans. They regarded him merely as a magician. His fame was so limited that it did not deserve to have been noticed. It was only in the development of his legend that it grew greater and greater. It was also the legend that gave rise to the centres of his cult, which otherwise would remain scarce. That is why information on his cult at Antioch and Ephesus is late, whereas earlier accounts come only from Tyana and Aegaeae. Trying to popularize the figure of Apollonius, Philostratus made him visit dozens of cities. Yet we know that he saw few of them. Another who knew that was St. John Chrysostom who wrote that Apollonius was famous only in a limited area: καὶ αὐτὸς ἔλαμψε ἐν μικρῷ μέρει τῆς οἰκουμένης.

We shall see in the chapters that our hypothesis on Apollonius' "cities" and on his certain popularity only in

⁹⁴ Penella, *op. cit.*, p. 139.

⁹⁵ *De Laudibus S. Pauli Apost.* 4 (PG 50, 490); Bowie would like to see also Crete as a place of Apollonius' activity (*op. cit.*, p. 1687).

the eastern part of the Empire is justifiable. His magic, teachings, philosophy, and legend are mentioned only by the authors from the Greek East. In the West Apollonius remained unknown till the second half of the fourth century, except at a small circle of the court of the Severi. It was only then that he appeared there, but relatively quickly was forgotten. He was to return there thanks to the Italian Renaissance. On the other hand, a constant memory of him was preserved only in the East in the works by Byzantine and Arabic writers.

CHAPTER III

TRADITION ON APOLLONIUS' MAGIC

Mediterranean routes of Apollonius' journeys were invented by Philostratus. He also made Apollonius travel to India¹; this, however, appears more probable to the reader of his book. We are easier to believe that Apollonius made his way to Persia and India when roaming through eastern parts of Asia Minor and southern Syria, than that he visited the West several times, where anyway he was not much known. It was only in the times of the Severi and then again in the second half of the fourth century that his legend was imported there. The tradition of the sage and magician was always cherished in certain Greek cities and by certain Greek authors till the late Byzantine times. Thanks to them the Arabs became acquainted with the figure of Apollonius and grew "fond" of him.

Moiragenes, apparently an Antiochian, presents Apollonius in his *Apomnèmata* first of all as a magician and then as a philosopher (μάγου καί φιλοσόφου ἀπομνημονεύματα). Moiragenes, who wrote already after Apollonius' death and utilized various sources, must have known the tradition preserved at Aegaeae, Tyana, Antioch and Ephesus. Maximus, Apollonius' next biographer, also referred to the tradition preserved at Aegaeae and Cilicia.

¹ On Apollonius' stay in India and with the Gymnosophists in Ethiopia see: J. CHARPENTIER, *The Indian Travels of Apollonius of Tyana* (in) *Skrifter utgivna av K. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Uppsala* 29, 3, 1934, pp. 1-66; Th. HOPFNER, *Die Brahmanen Indiens und die Gymnosopisten Ägyptens in der Apollonios-biographie des Philostratos*, *Archiv Orientalni* 6, 1934, pp. 58-67; Meyer, *op. cit.*, p. 373 ff.; A. TRELOAR, *Ethiopians*, *Prudentia* 4, 1972, pp. 42-50.

the eastern part of the Empire is justifiable. His magic, teachings, philosophy, and legend are mentioned only by the authors from the Greek East. In the West Apollonius remained unknown till the second half of the fourth century, except at a small circle of the court of the Severi. It was only then that he appeared there, but relatively quickly was forgotten. He was to return there thanks to the Italian Renaissance. On the other hand, a constant memory of him was preserved only in the East in the works by Byzantine and Arabic writers.

CHAPTER III

TRADITION ON APOLLONIUS' MAGIC

Mediterranean routes of Apollonius' journeys were invented by Philostratus. He also made Apollonius travel to India¹; this, however, appears more probable to the reader of his book. We are easier to believe that Apollonius made his way to Persia and India when roaming through eastern parts of Asia Minor and southern Syria, than that he visited the West several times, where anyway he was not much known. It was only in the times of the Severi and then again in the second half of the fourth century that his legend was imported there. The tradition of the sage and magician was always cherished in certain Greek cities and by certain Greek authors till the late Byzantine times. Thanks to them the Arabs became acquainted with the figure of Apollonius and grew "fond" of him.

Moiragenes, apparently an Antiochian, presents Apollonius in his *Apomnèmata* first of all as a magician and then as a philosopher (μάγου καὶ φιλοσόφου ἀπομνημονεύματα). Moiragenes, who wrote already after Apollonius' death and utilized various sources, must have known the tradition preserved at Aegaeae, Tyana, Antioch and Ephesus. Maximus, Apollonius' next biographer, also referred to the tradition preserved at Aegaeae and Cilicia.

¹ On Apollonius' stay in India and with the Gymnosophists in Ethiopia see: J. CHARPENTIER, *The Indian Travels of Apollonius of Tyana* (in) *Skifter utgivna av K. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Uppsala* 29, 3, 1934, pp. 1-66; Th. HOPFNER, *Die Brahmanen Indiens und die Gymnosopisten Ägyptens in der Apollonios-biographie des Philostratos*, *Archiv Orientalni* 6, 1934, pp. 58-67; Meyer, *op. cit.*, p. 373 ff.; A. TRELOAR, *Ethiopians*, *Prudentia* 4, 1972, pp. 42-50.

Lucian, who touched on Apollonius' magic in his dialogue *Alexander sive Pseudomantis*, was likely to have collected various stories about Apollonius which circulated in northern Syria and in Asia Minor.

This dialogue originated about 180 A.D.² Here, while presenting the figure of Alexander of Abonouteichos, Asclepios' false priest, Lucian seized the opportunity and scoffed at another priest of this god: Apollonius of Tyana³. Lucian writes that the charlatan Alexander, who posed as Pythagoras⁴, was a pupil and ἐραστής of a certain doctor (δημοσίᾳ ἰατρὸς). In turn, this professional doctor was a pupil of a well-known Apollonius of Tyana (τῶν Ἀπολλωνίῳ πάνυ συγγενομένων), educated by Apollonius, is described by Lucian as γόης, who specialized in black magic, deceitful tricks and in spells.

Thanks to them, claims Lucian, one could gain love, avert his enemies' bad intentions, discover a treasury, come into an inheritance, and so on. When reading this dialogue we also learn about Alexander's *modus operandi* itself. He was involved in selling oracles and prophecies uttered by a snake called Glycon. Never parting with it, Alexander claimed that it was a new incarnation of the god Asclepios himself⁵. Glycon's oracle founded by Alexander in Abonouteichos won great popularity. It was frequented by the emperor's highest officials and even Marcus Aurelius himself turned for advice there⁶.

² See PIR² A 370; Bowie, *op. cit.*, p. 1678.

³ *Alex. sive Pseudomantis* 5.

⁴ *Alex.* 4 It is commonly believed that Lucian's *Alexander* is a parody of Pythagoras' *Lives* (among others A.D. Nock, *Conversion, the Old and the New in Religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine of Hippo*, Oxford 1933, p. 91).

⁵ On Alexander of Abonouteichos cf. among others Bowersock, *Greek Sophists*, *op. cit.*, pp. 71 and 87; F. CUMONT, *Alexandre d'Abonutichos et le Néo-Pythagorisme*, *Revue d'Histoire des Religions* 86, 1922, p. 202 ff.; E.R. DODDS, *Pagan and Christian in the Age of Anxiety*, Cambridge 1965, p. 56 f.; Nock, *Conversion*, *op. cit.*, pp. 93-94.

⁶ *Alex.* 27 and 48.

What appears to be clear from Lucian's account is that Apollonius, whose pupil was a *goēs* and a doctor, was a doctor and a charlatan himself. The line of descent of false medicine from Apollonius through his pupil to Alexander of Abonouteichos is obvious. Lucian dedicated his dialogue to an Epicurean philosopher Celsus⁷. He described the figure of Apollonius in a very concise way as he knew that Celsus would guess "what sort of people he is writing about". Lucian's friend Celsus was the author of *Κατὰ μάγων*⁸ so he must have known Apollonius the magician very well. Thus it was sufficient for Lucian to mention his name only. Both writers had the same contemptuous attitude towards magic.

Lucian's account which originated about 180 A.D. and was so malicious and hostile to Apollonius is of primary importance for us. Lucian was born in Samosata in Commagene⁹. It is obvious that Apollonius was known in this Syrian region bordering with Cappadocia and Cilicia. The places of his cult were situated in its closest neighbourhood and might have been visited by Lucian during his journeys in Syria and Asia Minor. Lucian, malicious and ill-disposed towards mysticizing Pythagoreanism¹⁰, collected gossip and stories which were unfavourable to Apollonius. Also some of Apollonius' pupils might have cast a slur on his reputation, since not all of them faithfully followed their master. Moreover, there were some who distorted his teachings. One of them is described by Lucian.

Lucian's abusive remarks echo those pieces of informa-

⁷ Alex. 1.

⁸ H. CHADWICK (in) Origen, *Contra Celsum*, Cambridge-London-New York 1980, p. XXIV.

⁹ On Commagene see D. MAGIE, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor*, op. cit., I, p. 574.

¹⁰ Cf. J. BOMPAIRE, *Lucien Écrivain, Imitation et Création*, Paris 1958, pp. 615-18; M. CASTER, *Lucien et la Pensée religieuse de son Temps*, Paris 1937, pp. 9-122.

tion on Apollonius which are preserved by Moiragenes and Maximus (as related by Philostratus). Lucian must have known that Apollonius was a Pythagorean because he linked him to Alexander who also alleged his kinship with Pythagoreans. By ridiculing this philosophy, Lucian also confirms what Moiragenes wrote about the attitude towards Apollonius maintained by his contemporary philosophers. According to Moiragenes it was not only Euphrates who opposed Apollonius but also a certain Epicurean philosopher. Lucian addressed his dialogue about charlatanistic activities of Alexander the Pythagorean to Celsus the Epicurean. He knew that Apollonius had been a magician and followed the philosophers described by Moiragenes in his opinion that Apollonius had promoted forbidden magical practices. Writing about the medical art practised by the doctor and *goēs* educated by Apollonius, he confirms at the same time that Apollonius was a doctor himself. He must have heard about it either in Tyana or in Aegaeae. Apollonius' pupil, also a Tyanean, who was mentioned by Moiragenes, might have been really educated by Apollonius, yet the methods he employed were at variance with his master's medicine. As we remember, Apollonius had recourse to magic as a part of Asclepios' medicine, but he never practised it as a substitute for the latter. However, Apollonius' pupil turned his art into a common and shallow charlatanism. Clearly Lucian exaggerates in the description of his conduct, and while commenting on his jugglings, he uses malicious rhetoric¹¹. Lucian subscribes to views on Apollonius held by the latter's contemporaries and once expressed by Moiragenes: rationalistic philosophers and men of letters of the end of

¹¹ Taggart, *Apollonius of Tyana, His Biographers*, op. cit., p. 37 ff.; cf. also G. ANDERSON, *Studies in Lucian's comic Fiction*, Leiden 1976, pp. 89-94; CH. ROBINSON, *Lucian and his Influence in Europe*, Dutchworth 1979, pp. 59-60.

the first and of the second centuries did not show much respect to Apollonius. In a very vague way Lucian writes about a certain tragedy in Apollonius' life whose course and cause were apparently known to Apollonius' pupil, so derided by Lucian (πᾶσαν αὐτοῦ τραγωδίαν εἰδότες). Is it not possible then that what Lucian means here is a failure of Apollonius' philosophy which he linked to his magical practices and which was unpopular among Greek intellectuals? It might have been the reason of Apollonius' disillusionment and misfortunes. Philosophers of his time were relentless: Euphrates, who most probably was his open enemy in Syria, had a low opinion of him; a certain Epicurean fought against him; unfavourable, and even inimical opinions on Apollonius were spread still in Lucian's, and even in Cassius Dio's, times.

As we learn from Apollonius' two letters to Euphrates (Epp. Apoll. 16 and 17), this well-known Stoic philosopher called Pythagoreans the magicians. At that time, it was a generally accepted attitude towards Pythagoreanism. Apollonius tried to explain to Euphrates what being a magician really meant¹². According to him a magician might be anyone who worshipped gods and imitated them in his life: ὁ θεραπευτὴς τῶν θεῶν (Epp. Apoll. 17). Although Apollonius repeats Plato's view here¹³, we feel that he expresses his own belief, as he admits that the kind of religion held by the Persian Magi is closest to his spiritual needs. The Magi's persuasion is his religion. As we can see such a notion of magic remains in a complete opposition to charlatanism and to γοητεία which was imputed to

¹² On magic and charlatanry cf. *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (ed. J. Hastings), Edinburgh 1964, v. VIII, pp. 271-72; 278-86 and passim s.v., Magic; on differentiation between μάγος and γόης see also Penella, *The Letters*, op. cit., pp. 99-101.

¹³ Penella, *ibid.*, p. 101 (a commentary to Epp. Apoll. 17), *Encyclopaedia of Religion*, op. cit., p. 272.

Apollonius by Euphrates, by a certain Epicurean not named by Moiragenes, and by Lucian.

The pre-Philostratean inventors of those two letters meant to whitewash the philosopher and magician whom they admired. After all, they knew that Apollonius had professed the religion which was valued in the Greek world and yet not acknowledged as the official one¹⁴. They must have been aware that it was a crushing argument used against Apollonius by the philosophers who came out against this worshipper of Pythagoras and against the Magi. Moreover, they knew that Apollonius' magic had not consisted only in a virtuous religious life, but that in practice it took the shape of prophecies, visions, and thaumaturgies. That is why they had to provide it with a theoretical frame.

In Epp. Apoll. 48 Apollonius writes that he is quite aware of ambivalent opinions held on him, but the only thing he can do is to put up with it. Similar contradictory opinions were expressed on Pythagoras, Orpheus, Plato and Socrates. They were also said to have practised magic and to have maintained contacts with the Magi¹⁵. Apollonius is certain that his religion raises him above the common and above the philosophers who are not engaged in magic. Thanks to magic he can develop friendly relationship with gods and demons, and he knows *πᾶσαν θεῖαν μαντικήν* (Epp. Apoll. 52). As a magician and sage he is said to equal gods or even the god, whereas the gods proclaim him to be a «divine man» in their oracles (Epp. Apoll. 44 and 48).

As we could see the inventors of Apollonius' letters to Euphrates were engaged in theorising on Apollonius' magic;

¹⁴ Encyclopaedia of Religion, *ibid*.

¹⁵ J. BIDEZ, F. CUMONT, *Les Mages Hellénisés, Zoroaster, Ostanes et Hystaspes d'après la Tradition grecque*, Paris 1938, I, p. IX and 33; J. GAGÉ, *Basiléia, les Césars, les Rois d'Orient et les Mages*, Paris 1968, pp. 339-45.

in other letters this subject recurs in the context of Apollonius' religiousness and of his "divine" virtues. The first biographers of Apollonius wrote about his magical performances with approbation. Inhabitants of the cities he had visited remembered his words and magical gestures. Apollonius became fixed in their memory more firmly than any other magician, because in spite of Lucian's jeers he had not been interested in juggling tricks. Sometimes his achievements were impressive and raised him above the common. It was pointed out by Cassius Dio who extolled Apollonius' telepathic abilities which remained in agreement with the Ephesian tradition. Yet whenever he wrote about the Emperor Caracalla's fondness for Apollonius, for magicians and charlatans, he treated the Tyanean with contempt, like Lucian before (γότης καὶ μάγος ἀκριβής)¹⁶.

Aiming to ridicule the likings of the emperor whom he hated, Dio went so far as to repeat current, as we know, gossip which slandered Apollonius.

Such was a general attitude towards Apollonius' magic when around 220 A.D. Philostratus' work came out. Conversely to previous biographers and to his contemporary historians, Philostratus did not want to call the hero of his biography a magician. Like Lucian and Cassius Dio Philostratus did not like magic (VII 39) and he treated it solely as charlatanism (V 12). Although Philostratus utilized Moiragenes' *Memoirs* in his work, he thought him to have been ignorant of Apollonius (I 3; III 41). He blackened Moiragenes' reputation because the latter wrote the truth about Apollonius' magical practices. Philostratus knew that magic was banned and persecuted by the Roman law already since the XII Tables Codification¹⁷. He must have

¹⁶ Cf. chapter I, p. 38.

¹⁷ *Encyclopaedia of Religion*, op. cit., p. 271; F.H. CRAMER, *Astrology in Roman Law and Politics*, Philadelphia 1954, pp. 4; 8; 149-51; 222.

remembered the case of another philosopher Apuleius who followed Apollonius and openly admitted to have coupled, like Plato and Pythagoras, magic with philosophy¹⁸. He was aware of an unfriendly attitude assumed by Stoic and Epicurean philosophers, by men of letters and historians, towards magic. After all, he ment to introduce his hero, who was not only a magician but also a philosopher, for ever among famous and important figures from the world of Roman culture. So far neither Apollonius' pupils nor his biographers had managed to do that, as Lucian's and Cassius Dio's views on Apollonius do confirm it. For Philostratus it was a forbidding task, for he wanted both to present the reader with descriptions of Apollonius' miraculous achievements, and to persuade him that in truth Apollonius had not been a magician but a "divine man". That is why he decided to attribute these singular deeds not to *μαγεία* or *γοητεία* of Apollonius (as Lucian and Cassius Dio did), but to his *σοφία*. He made Apollonius visit the Brahmins, who were versed in a secret knowledge of the world, so that he could benefit from their teachings. Then he argued the reader into believing that this knowledge, together with Pythagorean asceticism, enabled Apollonius to guess events and to foresee the future *πρόγνωσις*, *μαντική* III 12; 42; 44), as well as that it gave him a gift for healing and curing (III 44). Philostratus ascribed Apollonius' supernatural skills also to his special inner power, which he called *δαιμονία κίνησις* (V 12), but never to his *μαγεία*. Reasoning in that way, Philostratus filled the pages of VA with Apollonius' prophecies and vision, with his healing and wonderworking practices. He made him, as he made Pythagoras, stay at two places at the same time (IV 10). He endowed him with a power over diseases

¹⁸ *Apologia* 27; *Florilegia* 15; on Apuleius and the lawsuit against his magic see: A. BIRLEY, *Septimius Severus, The African Emperor*, London 1971, pp. 50-58.

and over the death (V 45), the demons (IV 20; 25; 43; VI 27; 39) and over nature (II 14; 15; 33; III 27; IV 13; V 11; 35; VI 32). He put into his mouth prophecies on the reigns of some emperors (V II; VI 32), and made him foretell disasters (V 18).

Philostratus denies accusations brought against Apollonius because of his engagement in magical practices (I 2; V 12; VII 38-39; VIII 7/8, 7/9), but at the same he quotes incantations Apollonius used to chant (IV 4), he describes Apollonius' fire sacrifices (I 31), so typical of Persian magic, and his practice of necromancy (IV 45). In VA Apollonius holds sway over the evil powers, but also performs ordinary magical tricks and, as in Lucian's work, he helps a certain man to discover a treasure buried in the ground (VI 39).

In order to exculpate Apollonius from the charge brought against him of practising black magic-charlatanry, Philostratus made him appear at the court of the Emperor Domitian, where accusation of various magical practices used to be the main issue (VII 33; VIII 7)¹⁹.

The trial at Domitian's court concluded with Apollonius' victory, but in the reader's opinion he remained a magician practising not only beneficial magic, but sometimes also charlatanism. Apollonius' Philostratean "philosophy of magic" was a failure. Philostratus' stories are not much different from those spreading in Apollonius' "cities". Philostratus distorted them by introducing additional paradoxographic, magical and mythical elements. Consequently, we can find in VA a lion which Pharaoh Amasis was incarnated in, a tricephalic baby, Lamias, Empuses,

¹⁹ Cf. L. THORNDIKE, *A History of Magic and experimental Science*, New York 1923, I, p. 242 nn. As a true magician Apollonius appears in a Greek papyrus dating back probably to the fourth century A.D. (see K. PREISENDANZ, *Papyri graecae magicae* II, Leipzig 1931, p. 54, no XI a).

and satyr-like creatures from the world of myths and folk imagination. To all appearances Apollonius was not interested in the world of folk mythology. The only of his skills which can be attributed to his shamanistic powers was his ability to understand the language of the birds. Apart from that, his magic was of a different character. He was a prophet and a doctor, an expert in the laws of nature and in human needs.

The question about the origin of Apollonius' magic is difficult to answer. None of the sources, apart from Philostratus fabulous biographical work, mentions it. Most probably, and according to Philostratus, he was interested in this art following the whole Pythagorean school (VA i 2). He was likely to have believed that his master had been the worshipper of Zoroaster and that he had stayed at Babylon²⁰. Moreover, he was certain that Pythagoras had visited the Gymnosophists in Egypt; they descended from the Indian Brahmins and from them Apollonius learnt a secret knowledge of man and the universe (VA VIII 7). Following Pythagoras, in VA Apollonius travels to Persia, to the Gymnosophists in Ethiopia, and even further, to the very source of knowledge in India (VI 11). Pythagoreans contemporary to Apollonius, Nicomachus of Gerasa and Numenius of Apameia also held that both Pythagoreanism and Platonism were closely linked to the wisdom of the Brahmins, Jews, Magi and Egyptians²¹. It is also possible that the reason for Apollonius' admitting Persian religiousness (in Epp. Apoll. 16 and 17) was that he met

²⁰ The sources on Pythagoras' stay with the Persian Magi and in the East are collected by W.K.C. GUTHRIE, *A History of Greek Philosophy* I, Cambridge 1962, pp. 253-54; besides see: Bidez-Cumont, op. cit., pp. 33-34; Festugière, *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste* I, *L'Astrologie et les Sciences occultes*, Paris 1944, p. 22 f. E. ZELLER, *Die Philosophie der Griechen* I, 2, Leipzig 1891, p. 300 ff.

²¹ Bidez-Cumont, op. cit., p. 33; Taggart, op. cit., pp. 26-27; 41.

the colonies of the so called West Magi (Μαγουσαῖοι) from whom he absorbed religiousness permeated with certain secret practices²². Beginning with Arnobius of Sicca in Numidia, some of the sources reckon Apollonius as an outstanding magician, linked to the Persian and Median magic. It was Arnobius himself who included his name on the list which was headed with the name of Zoroaster²³.

In the Greek East the publication of Philostratus' work did not appear to be a turning-point between historical and mythical traditions on Apollonius. As we shall see below, Philostratus' exegesis of Apollonius' magic did not win much popularity among later authors. It was only in the fourth century, when the writers used Philostratus' work to combat Christianity, that they accepted it in its entirety. Those of the Greek authors who described Apollonius' particular achievements called him simply a magician and emphasized his wisdom and charity. Contrary to Philostratus, they did try to find any "superior" grounds for his magical deeds. Some of them, that is those who remained under the influence of the Church's ill-disposed attitude towards Apollonius, ascribed his practice to black magic and to demonic powers. Yet they also made it clear that Philostratus' biographical work was not their only source. According to the already mentioned "geography" of the sources which discuss Apollonius' magic, this subject was taken up by the Greek authors who had access to the original tradition of Apollonius preserved in the cities. As we shall see below, this situation persisted till post-Philostratean times. Apollonius aroused interest of those writers who met with his cult, saw his statues, read his

²² Bidez-Cumont, op. cit., pp. VI-VII and T.I. passim; F. CUMONT, *Les Religions Orientales dans le Paganisme romain*, 4th ed. Paris 1929, p. 134 f.; 170 nn.; *Die Mysterien des Mithra, Ein Beitrag zur Religionsgeschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Leipzig 1911, pp. 11-13.

²³ *Adversus Nationes* I 52 Reifferscheid.

works and works about him, and touched his talismans. We are certain that the post-Philostratean tradition on Apollonius was not solely shaped by Philostratus' work. This is the reason why we resorted to this tradition when we tried to recreate Apollonius' historical links with certain Greek cities. This was fully justifiable. Late sources are evidently influenced by Philostratus' work, albeit they do contain many elements unknown to Philostratus, derived from an autonomous tradition independent of him which persisted in Syria and Asia Minor. As the case of the Ephesian accounts proves, Philostratus had access to this tradition, but he either did not always make use of it, or he changed its elements, enriched it with his fantasies, or he freely transformed them. Yet above all he turned a blind eye to the truth about Apollonius, simplified his philosophy (which will be discussed at length in the next chapter), and he speculated about his magical practices.

The sources of the third century indicate that the biographical work of Philostratus was not popular at that time except at the court of the Severi. According to Origen, it seems that what was read then was Moiragenes' *Apomnèmata* and writings signed with the name of Apollonius himself. The works of Maximus of Aegaeae might have been also read, yet none of the sources mentions this. Origen the Platonist quoted a fragment from Moiragenes in his *Contra Celsum* published in 284 A.D.²⁴ Another Platonist Porphyry was an expert in Apollonius' philosophy and in his writings comprised a treatise *Περὶ θουσιῶν* and the letters²⁵. As it appears, Apollonius was known in philosophical circles contemporary to him. Porphyry must have also been interested in biographies of,

²⁴ Chadwick (in) Origen, op. cit., p. XV.

²⁵ Cf. chapter IV, p. 133. There are assumptions that Heliodorus in his *Ethiopica* utilized Philostratus' VA (cf. Reardon, op. cit., p. 334, note 57).

and stories about Apollonius circulating in the third century, since he remembered such a characteristic detail from his biography as Apollonius' ability to understand the language of the birds. Contrary to Origen Porphyry knew VA. He was the first author who referred to this work for ideological reasons. He was not interested in a literary value of Philostratus' work but he used it as a propagandistic vehicle for combating Christianity. We feel certain that as a Platonist Porphyry could not read Philostratus work with pleasure; it offered entertainment only to dilettanti. It seems that philosophers were interested in Apollonius' writings and in reliable works about him, such as undoubtedly the one written by Moiragenes. We read in *Suda Lexicon* that a certain Soterichos of Oasis wrote on Apollonius in Diocletian's times²⁶. None of the fragments has managed to persist, but we may conjecture that it vied with Philostratus' work at the end of the third century. Soterichos, a native of Libya, might have had more information on Apollonius than Philostratus before him.

Porphyry referred to Philostratus only to persuade Christians how great a magician Apollonius used to be²⁷. If A. Harnack's reconstruction is to be believed, Porphyry discussed the scene of Apollonius' trial at Domitian's court in one of the fragments of his anti-Christian treatise *Κατὰ Χριστιανῶν*. Harnack found this fragment in an apologetic work *Apocriticus* written by Macarios Magnes²⁸.

²⁶ *Suidae Lexicon*, s.v. Σωτήριχος (p. 410 Adler); Weinberger, Soterichos 1 RE Bd. 2A, Hbd. 5, col 1231.

²⁷ Porphyrius, "Gegen die Christen", 15 Büchern, Zeignisse Fragmente und Referate, Abhandlungen der Königl. Preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil. - Hist. Klasse Nr 1, 1916, Fragment 63 (pp. 84-85).

²⁸ Cf. HARNACK, loc. cit.; on Macarios Magnes' *Apocriticus* see: T.W. CRAFER, *The Apocriticus of Macarios Magnes*, London-New York 1919, pp. XIX-XXIII; R. WAELKENS, *L'Économie, Thème apologétique et Principe herméneutique dans L'Apocriticus de Macarios Magnes* (Recueil de Travaux d'Histoire et de Philologie, VI^e - serie, fasc. 4), Louvain 1974, p. 9.

According to Harnack, Macarios, a bishop of Magnesia who lived at the beginning of the fifth century, inserted Porphyry's arguments into his work. He wove them into a conversation held between a Christian and a pagan on the principles of Christian faith. In Macarios' work the pagan interlocutor repeats Porphyry's words saying that he cannot understand Christ who, as a god, allowed himself to be crucified. Despite the fact that Apollonius was only an eminent human and not a god, he did not let Domitian humiliate him; he vanished from his sight and appeared in Dicaerchia still on the same day. As this example clearly shows, Porphyry referred to such instances of Apollonius' magical performances which allowed him to prove superiority of the pagan magician over Christ. As we shall see in the next chapter Porphyry not only valued Apollonius' philosophy but also his thaumaturgy.

In the second fragment of *Contra Christianos* preserved by St. Jerome in *Breviarium in Psalmos*, Porphyry claims that Christ's miracles were by no means unique. He does not consider working miracles something outstanding (non enim grande est facere signa)²⁹. Equally successful were miracles worked by Apollonius and Apuleius (infinita signa fecerunt).

Porphyry was the first to show how to turn Philostratus' aretologic romance into a weapon against Christ from the Gospel, and that is why he referred to it in his work several times. Yet it was only Sossianus Hierocles who wrote an anti-Christian treatise where he utilized tales and stories from VA alone. We do not know when Porphyry's work came into being. It might have been in the times contemporary to Hierocles' treatise. The results of Barnes's

²⁹ *Breviarium in Psalmos*, Psalmus, LXXXI (PL 26, 1130, fragment 4, Harnack).

studies³⁰ raised some doubts as to whether Porphyry's work was really published in 270 A.D. On the other hand, Barnes claims that Hierocles' treatise was published on the threshold of the persecution of Christians in 302 A.D.³¹

Hierocles' treatise entitled *Φιλαλήθης λόγος πρὸς Χριστιανούς* became the reason of some revival of interest in the centers of Apollonius' cult which were forgotten when the dynasty of the Severi had died out. On the other hand, thanks to Eusebius of Caesarea's vehement retort, this work caused a violent reaction on the side of Christians and promoted a fierce fight of the Greek and later Latin Church with Apollonius.

Soon afterwards, as if in response to the publication of Hierocles' work, there began to appear talismans allegedly made by Apollonius in various cities of the Greek East. They appeared as unexpectedly as if Apollonius sent them from heaven, from where he was taking care of the suffering - the fact recorded in the Adana inscription. Before we try to form a hypothesis on their origin, let us first analyse their characteristics contained in Byzantine sources. Here we intend to discuss the writers who remembered Apollonius' magic, in order to demonstrate how often it was recalled in the times of late antiquity and of Byzantium. We shall not fail to mention Apollonius' pseudo-epigraphs which began to appear almost simultaneously with his talismans.

The appearance of Apollonius' talismans was a turning-point in the development of his legend. Now it entered a new phase because its content was enriched by a new, previously unknown element. Despite a wide circulation of

³⁰ *Porphyry against the Christians, Date and the Attribution of Fragments*, The Journal of Theological Studies XXIV, 1973, pp. 437-42.

³¹ Cf. T.D. Barnes, *Sossianus Hierocles and the Antecedents of the Great Persecution*, Harvard Studies in Classical Philology 80, 1976, p. 242.

Philostratus' work and his active participation in shaping Apollonius' legend, it retained its individual character in the Greek East. Philostratus' work gained popularity and a literary success thanks to Hierocles and Eusebius of Caesarea who fought against its author. Independently of VA, however, there began to grow a powerful legend on Apollonius' talismans, his pseudoepigraphs were being propagated, and his predictions and teachings were constantly repeated; all that was completely unknown to Philostratus. Some authors regarded Philostratus' biographical work as a serious historical source, worthy of support and trust. However, a majority of them knew it very superficially, as a second-hand source; others expressed their criticism. Photius in *Bibliotheca*³² presents the content of Philostratus' work with open contempt for Philostratus' lies and inventions. Especially irritating he finds incredible absurdities, as he writes, contained in the description of Apollonius' adventures in India. In the sixth century, still before Photius, Aeneas of Gaza claimed that Philostratus presented Apollonius as a sorcerer and attributed to him the views which could not have been held by the historical Apollonius (e.g. on transmigration of souls)³³.

The sources of the late antiquity echo Philostratus in presenting Apollonius as a Pythagorean sage, in enumerating his journeys and his links with Tyana. But one thing remains certain: Philostratus did not know Apollonius as a creator of talismans. He does not mention it anywhere in his biographical work, just as he does not mention Apollonius' visits to Byzantium.

The earliest reference to Apollonius' talismans comes from *Contra Hieroclem* written by Eusebius of Caesarea soon

³² *Bibliotheca* 44, p. 29 Henry.

³³ Theophrastus 17 f. Colonna; cf. Speyer, *Zum Bild des Apollonius von Tyana*, op. cit., p. 58.

after the publication of Hierocles' treatise³⁴. Here Eusebius recalls that certain queer implements attributed to Apollonius were used in his times: αὐτίκα τῶν νῦν εἶσεν οἱ περιέργους μηχανὰς τῇ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς /'Απολλωνίου/ ἀνακειμένας προσηγορία κατειληφέναι λέγουσιν. (CHXL).

After Eusebius it was the Adana inscription which possibly referred to Apollonius' talismans³⁵. As we have already written, at the time of Eusebius' response to Hierocles' work, Arnobius the Older of Sicca in Numidia recognized Apollonius as a continuator of Zoroaster's thought. Arnobius added that Apollonius had belonged to the magicians who used special plants, secret names and charms to produce miraculous cures and even to raise men from the dead³⁶.

Lactantius, Arnobius' pupil, who will be discussed more thoroughly in chapter V, described Apollonius' magic referring to the same example which was quoted by Porphyry. Judging this magic the Father of the Church arrived at different conclusions from the pagan Porphyry. At Domitian's court Apollonius proved that he was only a magician among the magicians, whereas Christ displayed his divinity by allowing himself to be crucified³⁷.

Only Pseudo-Justin wrote about Apollonius' talismans in a clear and overt way. He mentioned their dissemination probably in Antioch. As we already know, his work contains a dispute between a theologian and a Christian on, among others, Apollonius' magic and talismans. The Christian is concerned about the popularity and spread of Apollonius' talismans. He wonders how to explain their

³⁴ On the origin of *Contra Hieroclem* cf. Barnes, Sossianus Hierocles, op. cit., p. 242.

³⁵ Cf. chapter II, p. 68.

³⁶ *Adv. Nationes* I 52, loc. cit.

³⁷ *Div. Institutiones* V 3 Brandt.

magical powers as compared to the world of nature. He does not understand why the Church agrees to them. He also wonders why the god who, after all, is a demiurge and lord over nature, allows them. He feels that Apollonius' talismans should be regarded as a demon's tool. The theologian dispels his doubts saying that there is nothing evil about those objects because they were produced by Apollonius who was an expert in the powers governing nature and in the cosmic sympathies and antipathies: ὁ μὲν Ἀπολλώνιος, ὡς ἀνὴρ ἐπιστήμων τῶν φυσικῶν δυνάμεων καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐταῖς συμπαθειῶν τε καὶ ἀντιπαθειῶν. Talismans were produced by means of Apollonius' "natural" knowledge and that is why they did not contradict god's wisdom ruling the world. The theologian explicitly emphasizes a difference between Apollonius' skills and Christ's creative powers. According to him Apollonius only governs nature created, whereas Christ is the creator. Apollonius' achievements do not remain in opposition to the divine laws ruling the world; they only help people and make their life easier. At the same time the Christian's question tells us about the purpose of Apollonius' talismans. They were effective against floods, hurricanes, plagues of mice, and against various wild beasts³⁸.

Yet we should still remember that the god who allowed the use of talismans opposed Apollonius' oracle and rendered the demon inhabiting Apollonius' statue silent.

Like Pseudo-Justin, the Fathers of the Church always had a great problem with Apollonius. Even those, however, who continued Eusebius' polemic and were ill-disposed to Apollonius, could not somehow escape a feeling of partiality to him. They could not deny the fame of his talismans. We feel that Apollonius belonged to the Greeks of the East despite their adherence to Christianity. Isidorus

³⁸ *Quaest. et Resp.* 24, op. cit.

of Pelusium, ill-disposed to Philostratus because of the latter's biographical work on the magician of Tyana, frankly admitted that Apollonius' talismans provided help for citizens: ἐπ' ἀσφαλείᾳ τῆς οἰκήσεως³⁹.

At the time when some information on Apollonius' talismans entered the writings of the late antiquity writers, there also began to circulate pseudoepigraphs signed by Apollonius. From among the Greek pseudoepigraphs we know only one, which we have already mentioned: *The Book of Wisdom of Apollonius of Tyana* (Βίβλος σοφίας καὶ συνέσεως ἀποτελεσμάτων Ἀπολλωνίου τοῦ Τυανέως ὡς ἔγραψε καὶ ἐδίδαξε Δούστουμον (Σούστουμον) Θύλασσον).

It is a very important document in the development of Apollonius' legend. F. Boll⁴⁰, and then A.J. Festugière⁴¹, were inclined to assume that this work originated in the third or at the beginning of the fourth century. However, the author of the text frequently uses the verb στοιχειῶ which in the sense of casting a spell or performing magical charms appeared only in the late Byzantine texts. In this sense the verb was used for the first time by Cedrenos⁴², which might indicate that the text originated in the twelfth century. Yet it is possible that Cedrenos found this verb already in one of his sources. After all, he referred to earlier sources on Apollonius' magic and talismans. However, it would be difficult to claim that *The Book of Wisdom* was

³⁹ Epist., I 398 (PG 78, 405B); on this letter cf. Speyer, op. cit., p. 57.

⁴⁰ *Cat. Cod. Astr. Graec.*, op. cit., pp. 174-75.

⁴¹ *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismegiste*, op. cit., pp. 340-41. Festugière claims that this work originated between 217 and 311/13 A.D. (that is, according to him, between the date of VA publication and Eusebius of Caesarea's *Contra Hieroclem*).

⁴² The oldest text which contains such a name is *Parastaseis Syntomoi Chronikai* (67, 10; 73, 8-19 Preger) from the middle of the seventh century. Recently C. Blum discussed this problem in *The Meaning of Stoicheion and its Derivatives in the Byzantine Age*, *Eranos* 44, 1946, p. 315 ff. (non vidi).

written earlier than at the end of the fifth century. Some ideological links existing between *The Book of Wisdom* and Pseudo-Justin suggest that its content was considerably influenced by this anonymous writer.

In the address contained in the pseudoepigraph Apollonius turns to his pupil Sustumous Thalassos⁴³ and promises to initiate him into a secret knowledge (which was revealed to him) of how to charm objects created by god.

The author's foreword is followed by seven brief texts which contain secret names of the seasons, of the hours of days and nights, auspicious hours of particular days of the week, names of the months and of their archons, and secret names of the sky, the earth, and the winds in subsequent seasons. The last text contains four recipes for Apollonius' talismans: one for gathering birds in one place or for flushing them, another for doing the same only with pigeons, the next against fires, and the last one which describes the way to construct a mirror by means of which one can learn all secrets and which at the same time may serve for same telematic practices.

The text presents Apollonius as an expert in secret cosmic relations, in secret powers of nature, and in the structure of the universe. Already Pseudo-Justin attributed the knowledge of the laws of nature to Apollonius. According to him, however, Apollonius' knowledge was of a hermetic revealed character; Apollonius was also conversant with the problems of the influence of the stars on human fate. His knowledge was beyond ordinary cognition. The texts included elements of Christian, Judaic, and pagan

⁴³ This name is read variously: Boll, op. cit., p. 175, Festugière, op. cit., p. 340 read Soustumus or Postumus Thalassus; L. DELLA VIDA, *La Dottrina e i Dodici Legati di Stomathalassa*, Atti dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Classe Sc. Mor. Stor. Filol., ser. VIII, v. III, 1951, p. 480 note 2, and Bowie, op. cit., p. 1686 nte 136 read Doustoumos Thylassos or Soustoumos Thalassos.

religions⁴⁴. Pseudo-Justin's work was of a Christian character, whereas here we have a syncretic gnostic text. To prove the popularity of Apollonius' talismans the author of the text uses the argument used before by Pseudo-Justin. *The Book of Wisdom* tells us that Apollonius' astro-magical knowledge embedded in the talismans was acknowledged by a god "born from a virgin in Bethlehem", whose Advent was anyway foretold by Apollonius. Also he prophesied that this god would destroy pagan temples, but he would leave intact his talismans: τὴν δὲ ἀποτελεσματικὴν ἦν ποιήσω οὐκ ἀφανίσει and his sanctuary in Tyana (176, 29). Furthermore, *The Book of Wisdom* reports that Apollonius pursued his magical activities with god's consent and with his aid: ἡ μετ' αὐτοῦ δύναμις ἀπετέλεσα καὶ ἐστοιχείωσα. This was because Apollonius produced talismans for the good and for the needs of people. The analysis of this pseudoepigraph shows that the earlier origin of *The Book of Wisdom* is suggested not only by the links with Pseudo-Justin which we have pointed out. Speculations on propitious and ill-fated hours of the day and night are also repeated in a Gnostic work *Testamentum Adami*, which goes back to the fifth century⁴⁵.

Festugière thinks that Apollonius' pseudoepigraph was invented in a circle of Christian Gnostics who remained under the influence of Judaism and promoted some elements of pagan tradition⁴⁶. However, we would like to propound a stronger hypothesis: it was probably written by Christian Gnostics of Antioch because it seems that *The Book of Wisdom* originated in the same circle as Pseudo-Justin's

⁴⁴ Cf. Festugière, op. cit., p. 341; on syncretism in this work cf. also F. BOLL, *Aus der Offenbarung Johannis*, Amsterdam 1967, pp. 141-42; 177; F. NAU, *Apotelesmata Apollonii Tyanesis*, Patrologia Syriaca I, 2, Paris 1907, pp. 1370, 1383 and notes 2, 3.

⁴⁵ Weisser, op. cit., p. 30.

⁴⁶ Op. cit., p. 341.

work. On the basis of those two texts one can assume that there existed a group of Christians in Antioch, the city where various sects led an intensive religious life at that time, who accepted some pagan beliefs and incorporate them into Jewish persuasions and symbolism which they had adopted from Judaism (the names of the days and the hours, of the angels, the sun, the moon, the winds, etc., are given in Hebrew in *The Book of Wisdom*)⁴⁷. As we remember both Apollonius' talismans and prophecies were very popular in this city, and the Church had to assume a diplomatic attitude towards them. Notwithstanding the anti-Philostratean propaganda spread by Eusebius of Caesarea and by other Fathers of the Church, Apollonius' magic was accepted in Antioch and he himself was discussed in a Christian text entitled *Quaestiones at Responsiones*, written by Pseudo Justin. His magical achievements in Antioch were also described in the pseudoepigraph which was a compilation of various syncretic views. Gnostics made Apollonius a possessor of a revealed knowledge thanks to which he could "cast spells on the things of the world which had been created by god". Similar views to those expressed by Pseudo-Justin in *The Book of Wisdom* can be found in various Greek texts written not only by the Antiochian authors, despite the fact that the majority of the Fathers of the Greek Church assumed unfavourable attitude towards

⁴⁷ In chapter II we have already mentioned the variety of Christian and pagan religious life in Antioch of the late Empire (in the Byzantine times cf. DOWNEY, *A History of Antioch in Syria*, op. cit., p. 433 and passim ad finem). It should be mentioned that there existed Gnostic sects which admired Christ along with pagan men: for instance a sect of Carpocratians worshipped Christ together with Pythagoras, Plato and Aristotle, and admired their effigies (cf. J. STRAUB, *Heidnische Geschichtsapologetik in der christlichen Spätantike, Untersuchungen über Zeit und Tendenz der Historia Augusta* (Antiquites Reihe 4, Beiträge zur Historia Augusta Forschung Bd. 1), Bonn 1963, p. 169 note 129. On the same also Georges M.A. HANFMANN, *Socrates and Christ*, Harvard Studies in Classical Philology LX 1951, pp. 205-33.

Apollonius' talismans. What is interesting, however, is that nobody questioned the efficiency of those products of Apollonius' magic.

In the sixth century the Antiochian Malalas wrote about Apollonius' talismans with admiration and approval, whereas in the seventh century a patriarch of Antioch Anastasius Sinaita, who lived on the turn of the sixth century and might have been an Antiochian, expressed his aversion to them. In *Quaestiones et Responsiones ad Orthodoxos*⁴⁸ he writes that Apollonius' talismans could be seen in his times. Placed in some cities they protected against "four-footed animals" and against birds which caused damage to people, against floods of rivers and against other disasters, fatal to people. According to Sinaita those talismans were in fact produced by demons and not by Apollonius: οὐ μόνον δὲ ἐν τῇ ξωῇ αὐτοῦ ταῦτα εἰργάσαντο δι' αὐτοῦ οἱ δαίμονες. Such was the situation in the magician's lifetime and such it remained after his death. Anastasius also describes a visit paid by three magicians to Rome in Domitian's times, who summoned them deliver the city from a plague it suffered. The three magicians were Apuleius, Julianus, and Apollonius⁴⁹. Julianus appeared to have been the greatest sorcerer and it was he who helped Rome.

When Gregory Cedrenos writes about Apollonius' talismans placed in Antioch, he repeats Malalas' information. He discusses a talisman protecting people against scorpions and a magical ceremony against mosquitoes set up by Apollonius. But he also endorses views on their impure origin.

⁴⁸ 20, PG 89, 524 D-525 C; a discussion on the origin of Sinaita cf. Speyer, op. cit., p. 60.

⁴⁹ Cf. R.J. PENELLA, *An overlooked Story about Apollonius of Tyana in Anastasius Sinaita*, *Traditio XXXIV*, 1978, pp. 414-15; Speyer, op. cit., pp. 61-62.

Much earlier than Cedrenos, already in the fifth century, two Fathers of the Greek Church; Neilos of Ancyra⁵⁰ connected with Antioch, and Basil of Cilician Isauria, condemned Apollonius' talismans as the products of demonic powers. Basil, who lived in a Cilician city neighbouring with Tyana, must have seen Apollonius' talismans which were certainly situated in his native city. He called them: τὰ μιὰ καὶ δυσὰ γῆ ἀποτελέσματα⁵¹.

The second city of Apollonius' talismans was Byzantium⁵². It is reported by many writers, beginning with Malalas and Hesychios of Miletus. The latter places his account of Apollonius' visit to this city in the times between Dinaeus (the second mythical ruler of Byzantium) and Philip of Macedon. Malalas writes that during Domitian's rule Apollonius made his way not only to Antioch but also to Byzantium. There he left many talismans in order to help the Byzantines in their troubles. In the city he placed talismans representing storks, the Lycos River which cut across the city, a tortoise, horses, and some other miraculous devices⁵³. Hesychios of Miletus writes that Apollonius placed in Byzantium three storks made of stone and facing each other. They successfully kept storks away from the city. The birds were dangerous for the Byzantines because they dropped snakes into cisterns which poisoned water with their venom. Hesychios claims that thanks to the stony storks, storks kept away from the city even in his own times⁵⁴. In the middle of the ninth century Gregory

⁵⁰ Epistulae 2, 148 (PG 79, 269 A).

⁵¹ *De vita Sanctae Theclae* I (PG 85, 540 C-541 A).

⁵² All the sources on this subject are collected by W.L. DULIÈRE, *Protection permanente contre des Animaux nuisible assurée par Apollonius de Tyana dans Byzance et Antioche. Evolution de son Mythe*. *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 63, 1970, pp. 247-77; some of Dulière's views are criticized by Speyer, op. cit., p. 47 f. and 56 f.

⁵³ Op. cit., p. 263-66 Bonn.

⁵⁴ Hesychios, *Patria Cpleos* 25, p.l. Preger.

Monachos described the same talismans which had been discussed by Malalas and Cedrenos, and called them δαιμονικά⁵⁵. Later Cedrenos wrote that στοιχειωματικός Apollonius of Tyana came to Byzantium and cast a spell (ἐστοιχείωσεν) on the snakes and scorpions to prevent their reproduction. Apart from that Apollonius contributed to driving mosquitoes out of the city. Moreover, he restrained wild horses from kicking, and ordered the Lycos River to cease destroying Bazantium with its floods⁵⁶. Cedrenos claims that Apollonius' first visit to Byzantium took place during the reign of the Emperor Claudius. The second one Apollonius paid in Domitian's times⁵⁷. Having disappeared from Domitian's sight during his trial, Apollonius set off to Byzantium. There he erected the same talismans which used to stand during the rule of Claudius.

In the twelfth century an anonymous author wrote that Apollonius' talismans, that is a mosquito made of bronze, a fly, and other animals⁵⁸, were placed in the western portico of the Forum Tauri in Byzantium. The anonymous author writes that the Emperor Basil of Macedon destroyed them because of his ignorance. The author knows Apollonius' prophecies too, and claims that he placed bronze tablets with the history of the past and of the future in Byzantium. Those who were privy to prophecies thought them true⁵⁹. Also in the twelfth century John Tzetzes, whom we have already mentioned, repeated the information on Apollonius' fight against various creatures both at Antioch and at Byzantium. He quoted the story about the storks and snakes (a talisman in the shape of storks facing each other and made of marble) which he wove into the

⁵⁵ *Chronicon* II, 444, 15 f. De Boor.

⁵⁶ *Op. cit.*, pp. 346-7 and 431 Bonn.

⁵⁷ *Loc. cit.*

⁵⁸ *Patria Cpleos* III 200, p. 278 Preger, cf. III 24, p. 221 Preger.

⁵⁹ *Loc. cit.*

history of wars between Byzantium and barbarians; he reported Apollonius' conflict with Domitian and remembered Apollonius' prophecies in Antioch ⁶⁰.

In the thirteenth century Nicetas Choniates came up with another version of the story about the venomous snakes which plagued Byzantium. He wrote that Apollonius had placed a bronze eagle in the hippodrome in Byzantium which was to protect the citizens against them. The eagle held a snake in its claws and filled the citizens of Constantinople with amazement and admiration. The wings of the eagle were marked with various hours of the day. Twelve of them shone very brightly when the clouds did not screen the sun-beams. This impressive talisman was destroyed by the crusaders in 1204 A.D. ⁶¹. According to Nicetas Choniates Apollonius made this eagle thanks to demons's help.

In the same century Pseudo-Gregory Codinos wrote that Apollonius placed in Byzantium his talismans in the shape of mosquitoes, rats and other small creatures, which kept away those animals and insects from the city. Besides, he recalled Apollonius' prophecies which were publicly displayed in Byzantium. He called Apollonius a sage (σοφός), and an outstanding astrologer ἄριστος ἀστρονόμος ⁶².

Finally in the fourteenth century Niceforos Callistos repeated what the earlier chroniclers had written. Apollonius drove snakes and scorpions out of Byzantium and tamed wild horses. However, he did that by means of demonic powers: δαιμονικαῖς τισιν ἀρρήτοποιαῖς and of charms: ἐπικλήσεσι φυγαδεῦσαί φασι ⁶³. The same opinion on

⁶⁰ *Chiliades* II, pp. 925-32.

⁶¹ *Historiae*, p. 651 Dieten.

⁶² *Patria Cpleos* II 79, 103; III 24, p. 191; 201; 221 Preger.

⁶³ *Ecclesiasticae Historiae* III (PG 145, 919 B-C).

Apollonius' talismans was expressed by Michael Glycas in the fifteenth century⁶⁴.

Malalas, Hesychios and Tzetzes were well-disposed to Apollonius' magic and did not attribute it to an impure power. A similar attitude was assumed by Gregory Syncellos in the ninth century who held a most favourable opinion on Apollonius. He wrote that Vespasian, having been informed about Apollonius' positive attitude towards Christ, wanted to speak to him and to learn what Apollonius thought about Christ and about the future Kingdom of Christ⁶⁵. Distorting Philostratus' data he wrote that Apollonius was a native of Tyana in Italy. He held that Apollonius had acted in Claudius' times and that he had died during the reign of Domitian, first prophesying Nerva's accession to the throne⁶⁶.

Those of the authors who wrote favourably about Apollonius' magic might have based their arguments on the views expressed in the sixth century by a scarcely known Christian writer from Syria or Palestine, traditionally called Pseudo-Nonius⁶⁷. Later his views were repeated by Cosmas of Jerusalem at the turn of the seventh century⁶⁸. Pseudo-Nonius reckoned Apollonius as a magician involved in white magic (ἡ μαγεία ἐπικλησίς ἐστι δαιμόνων ἀγαθοποιῶν πρὸς ἀγαθοῦ τινος σύστασιν). He differentiated between magic (μαγεία), charlatanry (γοητεία), and the art of poison-preparing (φαρμακεία). Magic, which was practised by Apollonius, consisted in calling up and employing good spirits, well-disposed to people, whereas charlatanry resolved itself into calling up spirits besides the graves, and into associating with demons. Both charlatanry

⁶⁴ *Annales* III, p. 445 Bonn.

⁶⁵ *Chronographia* I, p. 646 Bonn.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 655.

⁶⁷ Ad. S. GREGORII NAZ. *Orat. I Contra Julianum* 70 (PG 36, 1021 B-D).

⁶⁸ Ad. *Carmina* S. Gregorii 64 (PG 38, 491).

and poison-preparing were forbidden. Because Apollonius was involved in white magic, his θεσπίσματα (in that way Pseudo-Nonius described Apollonius' talismans) served a good aim. Pseudo-Nonius held that magic had been invented by the Medes and the Persians had expanded it. Arnobius advocated a similar view. The same was repeated after Pseudo-Nonius by other writers⁶⁹.

In Arabic literature, where Apollonius (here called Balīnās)⁷⁰ found its place when the Arabs conquered a part of the Greek East, there is a whole Corpus of Balīnās' works⁷¹. He entered the Arabic tradition as a "lord of the talismans" (sāhib aṭ-ṭilasmāt) and a sage (al-ḥakīm)⁷². Al-Qazwīnī and other cosmographers wrote in the thirteenth century that he had erected telesmatic statues in Constantinople, Caesarea of Palestine, Ctesiphon, Ecbatana, Qumm, Isfahan, Armenia and in Hyrcania⁷³. The inhabitants of the above cities and regions, who heard about Apollonius' telesmatic fame, invited him to suppress natural plagues and invasions of wild beasts and insects. Thus in Ctesiphon Apollonius left a talisman directed against the winds, scorpions and fleas; in Ecbatana he placed a statue of a lion on the gate protecting against the snowfall; in Isfahan he made a talisman against vermins, in Qumm a talisman preventing from solving a mystery of gold and silver

⁶⁹ Speyer, op.cit., pp. 55-56. Dulière, *Protection permanente*, op. cit. pp. 256-57.

⁷⁰ On the name Balīnās = Apollonius, cf. L. LECLERC, *De l'Identité de Balīnās et d'Apollonius de Tyane*, Journal Asiatique, ser. 6, 14, 1869, pp. 111-31; P. KRAUS, *Jābir ibn Hayyān*, op. cit., II, p. 292; M. ULLMANN, *Die Natur-und Geheim-Wissenschaften in Islam, Handbuch der Orientalistik*, Abt 1, Bd. 6, 2, LEIDEN-KÖLN 1972, p. 379 and note 3; M. PLESSNER, *Balinus* (in) *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, ed. I, Paris 1960, p. 1024; Weisser, op. cit., p. 3-5.

⁷¹ Cf. Weisser, op. cit., p. 28 ff.

⁷² Ibid., p. 23 and 36.

⁷³ Kraus, op. cit., pp. 292-93.

deposits, in Hyrcania protecting against vermins, and in Armenia he left a certain unspecified talisman⁷⁴.

In *The Great Book of Talismans Addressed by Balinās to his Son Aštūmūn* (or Aštīyūmūn; *Abdarrahman*)⁷⁵, we find a description of Apollonius' travels and talismans also in eastern cities. This text contains a very distant reminiscence of Philostratus. Being pursued by a king who wanted to kill him, Balīnās came to Tyre in a miraculous way, from where he escaped to Antioch; there, as we have already mentioned, he defeated a demon and placed various talismans. Then he made his way to Ephesus where he made a magical figure as well. Later he moved to Edessa and erected talismans in public baths. From there he set off to Emesa and left talismans protecting its citizens against scorpions; then he made for Persia where by means of a talisman he ordered ravens to fetch rare fruits from distant countries (?), in Nubia and Byzantium he placed talismans protecting from moths, whereas in Alexandria he constructed a miraculous mirror. Although this description of Apollonius' telematic wonderings is quite amusing, it is not what is most interesting in this Arabic text. It is significant that a part of *The Book of Wisdom* is repeated in *The Great Book of Talismans* and that the name Aštīyūmūn (or Aštūmūn) corresponds to the Greek Σούστουμος⁷⁶. The first part of *The Great Book of Talismans* repeats the Greek

⁷⁴ Cf. also Ullman, op. cit., p. 379 and note 3.

⁷⁵ Kraus, op. cit., pp. 293-96.

⁷⁶ Weisser, pp. 28-30; *The Book of Wisdom* also appeared in Latin under the title Balenus, De XXIV Horis (L. THORNDIKE, P. KIBRE, *A Catalogue of Incipits of Mediaeval Writings in Latin*, Cambridge Mass., 1973, col. 288). *Clavis maioris sapientiae*, the work whose author Artefius introduces himself also as Apollonius' pupil, belongs to a series of pseudoepigraphical works connected with Apollonius of Tyana in the Middle Ages (L. DELLA VIDA, *Something more about Artefius and his Clavis Sapientiae*, *Speculum* XIII, 1938, pp. 80-85), M. BERTHELOT, *Histoire des Sciences, La Chimie au Moyen Age, Doctrines et Pratiques chimiques*, Paris 1893, p. 250.

text which concerns the symbolism of days and nights, propitious and ill-fated hours, and the archons of the planets with the Hebrew names of the signs of the zodiac. The author quotes this text to indicate appropriate seasons for producing talismans. Moreover, he describes the process of this production mostly referring to Apollonius' talismans which already existed at that time, that is to those helping to drive away or to lure vermin, birds, snakes, fish and scorpions. A fragment of the introduction and the end of *The Book of Wisdom* is also repeated in another Arabic work entitled *On the Talismans of the Moon*⁷⁷. Yet this is not the last of the numerous Arabic pseudoepigraphs which have their roots in Apollonius' Greek apocryphs. We have at our disposal yet another Arabic pseudoepigraph entitled *Doctrine and Twelve Commandments of Stomathalassa*. Like *The Book of Wisdom* this work belongs to popular hermetic literature and is derived from a Syrian original compiled in the sixth century A.D.⁷⁸. It not only belongs to the same literary genre as *The Book of Wisdom* but it is also connected with the latter in various ways. The address of the work tells us that the sage Sustomos Thalassos (hence Stomathalassa) transmitted his wisdom, which he had acquired by means of a revelation, to his pupil Teon⁷⁹. Having analysed this text, Levi Della Vida came to a simple conclusion that it was written by the same Sustumos Thallassos who — according to the Greek pseudoepigraph — had been educated by Apollonius himself⁸⁰. Stomathalassa's doctrine, proves L. Della Vida, also originated in a Christian milieu permeated with Christian, pagan and Gnostic elements. What follows below is

⁷⁷ Weisser, op. cit., p. 32.

⁷⁸ L. Della Vida, *La Dottrina e i Dodici Legati di Stomathalassa*, op. cit.

⁷⁹ Ibid., pp. 480-82.

⁸⁰ Ibid., pp. 479-80 and note 2.

its brief outline. Stomathalassa, feeling his approaching death, transmitted the twelve commandments on man and cosmos to his pupil (whom, following the eastern custom, he calls his son). Stomathalassa's twelve commandments are preceded by an appeal where the sage persuades his pupil to take care of his soul, to refrain from unwise steps and carnal pleasures, and to perfect his soul. The first five of the commandments contain simple folk morality, whereas the sixth one describes the relation between the soul and the flesh and the need of taking care of one's soul. The seventh commandment tells about an organic relationship between the human soul situated "in the uppermost part of the head" and the seven senses which, in turn, correspond to seven thousand years of the world's existence. This truth, claims Stomathalassa, was denied to the greatest Greek sages. It was known only by Chiron, Hermes Trismegistos and Zosimos. From the eighth commandment we learn that the organs of the senses and the limbs constitute a microcosm, and correspond to particular fragments of the natural world. The ninth commandment discusses twelve inner senses of man which are responsible for his correct judgement. In the tenth commandment the author recurs to the problems of the human soul and to its divine origin, and he comes out with a theory of the Holy Trinity. The eleventh and twelfth commandments comprise his views on the structure and shape of the earth and cosmos, and on astronomical and astrological phenomena. The author describes planets favourable and unfavourable to various actions, and he derives horoscopes for the subsequent months of the year from the reciprocal position of the sun and the moon. The twelfth commandment contains much information on geological and meteorological phenomena. It answers the question why the earth is warm in winter and cold in summer, why the star Orion appears in winter and disappears in summer. It describes the

character and shape of the subterranean world, and so on. Besides, the author considers the influence of the sun and the moon on various atmospheric phenomena.

L. Della Vida tries to prove that the doctrine and the first ten commandments reflect ideas prevalent in the late Hellenic times, and that the Syrian original is based on Greek prototypes⁸¹. The last fragment of the work (commandments 11 and 12) is of a different character — it is devoted to cosmology, meteorology and astronomy. Here L. Della Vida finds conceptions and notions peculiar to the whole of the ancient East which on the one hand penetrated the Greek tradition of classical times, and on the other hand spread in Syrian literature. He claims that the last part of Stomathalassa's doctrine is certain to have originated in the sixth century, most probably in northern Mesopotamia or in Syria⁸². He assumes that there existed a sort of Apollonius' "school" which linked the hermetic text mentioning Apollonius' pupil to the work containing typical Mesopotamian cosmographical and astronomical doctrines. It was there, claims L. Della Vida, that Apollonius, thanks to the activities of his admirers, appeared in the late Hellenism as a hero of Greek hermetic texts already permeated with Christianity⁸³.

L. Della Vida's conception seems to corroborate my views on the origin of the pseudoepigraphic text signed with the name of Apollonius, and of the sources which belong to the late antique tradition of Apollonius. The text written by Apollonius' pupil Sustumos Thalassos, who transmitted his wisdom to Teon, most probably comes from the same place where Pseudo-Justin's work and *The Book of Wisdom* was invented, and where *The Great Book of Talismans*

⁸¹ Op. cit., p. 482.

⁸² Ibid., p. 484.

⁸³ Ibid., pp. 486-87.

had its roots. We assume that the place was northern Syria and there most probably Antioch which for the longest period of time kept a leading role in preserving Apollonius' tradition. This may be proved both by the aforementioned sources and by the works of Malalas and Cedrenos. The former texts; the anonymous Christian treatise and the Greek and Arabic pseudoepigraphs, present Apollonius as ἀνὴρ φυσικός an expert in the powers and laws governing cosmos and as a holder of a divine revelation. Stomathalassa's doctrine upholds this image of Apollonius, but it does not mention his talismans; instead it puts greater emphasis on his natural wisdom, rooted in his knowledge of divine laws of the world. Obviously, my assumption on the origin of pseudoepigraphic texts connected with Apollonius or with his pupil must find its corroboration in the studies undertaken by Orientalists. I only bring to notice certain issues which arose during my investigation of Apollonius' late tradition. The students of literature of the East must either confirm or reject them, taking into consideration all Syrian and Arabic works on Apollonius.

Our conviction that it was the Syrians who derived from the Greeks the tradition of transmitting Apollonius' teachings and wisdom from generation to generation is also corroborated by the fact that there are other works signed with his name in this language⁸⁴, including a Syrian text containing Apollonius' inspired speech echoing Biblical moral teachings⁸⁵. This text brims with secret symbolism comprising Gnostic views on good and evil which assert that matter is the source of sin⁸⁶. The text is expressed in a metaphorical and grandiloquent style, full of Apollonius'

⁸⁴ Ibid., p. 480 note 4.

⁸⁵ It was published by R. GOTTHEIL, *Apollonius von Tyana*, Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenlandischen Gesellschaft 47, 1892, pp. 466-70.

⁸⁶ On gnosis see among others A.D. NOCK, *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, Oxford 1972, II pp. 940-60; Downey, op. cit., p. 288 ff.

admonitions stigmatizing vices, carnal passions and the greed for material goods. Here Apollonius also enumerates talismans which he produced, as he claims, with the aid of god! The old motif from Pseudo-Justin and from *The Book of Wisdom* recurs in this Syrian work too. The talismans mentioned are numerous. Thanks to them one could rule over lions and panthers, wolves, bears, wild donkey and antelopes, foxes and hares, over all kinds of animals and wild beast, birds, fish of seas and rivers, snakes and mice. They are also effective against mosquitoes and flies, bees and ants, and against all kinds of "creeping" creatures.

In Syrian Gnostic-Christian pseudoepigraphs, as in Pseudo-Justin's anonymous work, Apollonius appeared as a sage and a magician — a creator of talismans. He taught the secrets of nature, educated people, and presented them with beneficial talismans. However, in the Syrian Church he was treated in a very unfriendly way. This finds its confirmation in the works of two Syrian Christian historiographers of the thirteenth century, Michael Syrus and Bar Hebraeus, who wrote that: In illo tempore (sub Claudio) Apollonius Tyanensis et Euphrates philosophi erant noti. Apollonius autem ille docuit talismana omnia operabatur ope daemonum et decebat. Vae mihi quia antecessit me filius Mariae. Quidam vocant illum πλάνιον⁸⁷.

So far we have discussed the texts concerning Apollonius which pertain to folk Hermetism. Already in the late antiquity Apollonius became connected with the works of the famous Hermes Trismegistos, the author of religious and philosophical treatises⁸⁸. This is confirmed by two sources.

⁸⁷ I quote in Latin after Nau, *Apotelesmata Apollonii Tyanesis*, op. cit., p. 1368.

⁸⁸ On Hermes Trismegistos cf. among others Festugière, *La Révélation I*, op. cit., pp. 67-88 and Festugière's and Nock's introduction (in) *Corpus Hermeticum*, I, Paris 1945.

An Antiochian, Ammianus Marcellinus compared Apollonius with Hermes Trismegistos in the fourth century when he wrote about some famous men protected by genii (*familiaris genios cum eisdem versatos*). Those chosen men were Pythagoras, Socrates, Numa Pompilius, Scipio Africanus, Marius, Octavian, Hermes Trismegistos, Apollonius of Tyana and Plotinus. They maintained constant spiritual ties with their demons which, in turn, taught them how to preserve the soul pure and free of vices, despite its links with mortal flesh⁸⁹.

In a similar way Apollonius is presented in the so called *Tübingen Theosophie*. In this text, which is a Christian fabrication of the fourth century based on an earlier pagan text⁹⁰, somebody asks the oracle about the names of men whose chaste life brought them closer to god. Apollo answers that such a privilege was granted only to few mortals: Hermes Trismegistos, Moses, and Apollonius⁹¹.

In two Arabic texts Apollonius appears as the one who transmitted Hermes Trismegistos' knowledge⁹². (Dahīrat al-Iskandar) Apollonius takes Hermes' book of wisdom from an underground hiding-place at the sea-side⁹³; in *The Book of the Mystery of Creation* (*Kitāb Sirr al-halīqa*) Apollonius discloses Hermes Trismegistos' knowledge to the world. This work of a physio-hermetic character, which contains the text of a mysterious Emerald Slab⁹⁴, was

⁸⁹ *Rerum Gestarum libri XXI*, 14, 5.

⁹⁰ Cf. JONES, *An Epigram*, op. cit., p. 193.

⁹¹ N. ERBSE, *Fragmente griechischer Theosophien*, Hamburger Arb. zur Altertumswiss. IV, Hamburg 1941, p. 177 (no 44).

⁹² The whole Arabic tradition on Hermes-Apollonius is presented by Ullmann, *Die Natur- und Geheimwissenschaften*, op. cit., pp. 378-81; M. PLESSNER, *Hermes Trismegistos and Arab Science*, *Studia Islamica* II, 1954, pp. 45-61.

⁹³ The content of this work is quoted by J. RUSKA, *Tabula Smaragdina*, op. cit., pp. 68-107.

⁹⁴ M. PLESSNER, *Neue Materialien zur Geschichte der Tabula Smaragdina*, *Der Islam* 16, 1927, pp. 77. 77-113; Ruska, op. cit., p. 107 ff.

compiled by the priest Saggiūs of Nābulus (Neapoli, Sychem); in the introduction he admits that he only rewrites a work of Balīnās, a master of hermetic practices. Balīnās, in turn, wrote it on the basis of Hermes' *Book of Wisdom* which he found in a grave-chamber in Tyana⁹⁵. *The Book of the Mystery* consisted of six parts, every one of which was devoted to separate problems, from theologico-philosophical considerations on the world and on its creator, through speculations on various ontological categories of the world, to the problems of man and the human soul in its last part⁹⁶. The date of its origin creates controversy in historical studies. A most interesting theory was launched by a leading student of Arabic alchemic literature, Kraus; soon he was followed by Weisser who expanded his assumptions. Kraus holds that the text of *The Book of The Mystery* which we know, goes back to the times of Caliph Mamūn (813-33 A.D.)⁹⁷. Then it was compiled on the basis of an earlier Syrian text which had originated in late Hellenic-Syrian times, that is in the fourth or fifth centuries. Apart from its links with other philosophical texts of those times, Kraus notices a relationship between *The Book of the Mystery*, in its doxographic part, and a treatise *On Human Nature* (περὶ ἀνθρώπου φύσεως) written by Nemesisius of Syrian Emesa, a Neoplatonist of the turn of the fourth century⁹⁸. The author of *The Book of the Mystery* utilized either Nemesisius' work or its immediate source. In the Arabic version elements of Christian theology provided by

⁹⁵ Kraus, op. cit., p. 272; Ruska, op. cit., pp. 124-63; Weisser, op. cit., p. 39 f.

⁹⁶ Cf. Weisser, op. cit., pp. 42-55 and next the translation of the whole work into German.

⁹⁷ Op. cit., p. 275 and Weisser, op. cit., p. 54.

⁹⁸ Ibid., Kraus, pp. 278-79 and Weisser, p. 63; *The Book of Mystery* was also translated into Latin by Hugo Sancticellus (cf. F. NAU, *Une ancienne Traduction latine du Bélinous arabe (Apoll. de Tyana)*, *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien*, 2^e ser. t. XII. 1907, p. 100).

Nemesius were expurgated. Both Kraus and Weisser assume that the origin of *The Book of the Mystery* should be traced to Aramaic Hellenising centres. In the fifth century philosophical neoplatonic studies flourished in Neapoli-Sychem. There taught the philosopher Marinus who was a pupil and successor of Proclus, a well-known Neoplatonist. Kraus ventures a guess that it might have been he who wrote the original of *The Book of The Mystery*, whereas an Arabic author Saggiūs of Neapoli-Sychem squared his version with the original one and expanded it⁹⁹.

Also in other works of Arabic authors Apollonius appears as a master of alchemy, philosophy and cosmogony¹⁰⁰. Apollonius' Arabic fortunes are vivid and interesting, yet they considerably surpass the scope of the present work.

Our hypotheses which connect the sources and places which preserve the tradition of Apollonius-Balīnās' magic and wisdom are not deeply grounded. Yet here is nothing unusual about this. The same situation repeats itself in all the studies on Apollonius. Despite a considerable fragmentariness of the sources which usually contain scant and legendary pieces of information, we have managed to prove in this chapter, which remains in a close logical relationship with the previous one, that the tradition of the magician and sage of Tyana was always, even in the Arabic and late Byzantine times, connected with the cities and regions where the historical Apollonius had lived and acted. As it appeared, a special role in the preserving of, and witness-

⁹⁹ Kraus, op. cit., p. 278 and note 5 and 279-80; Weisser, op. cit., pp. 68-72.

¹⁰⁰ Jābir ibn Hayyān, an Arabic scholar and alchemist, was especially interested in Apollonius (cf. Kraus, op. cit., pp. 290-303). In his writings Apollonius appears as a Pythagorean sage who propagates arithmological and cosmological theories. Krause thinks that it was Jābir and not Philostratus who presented Apollonius as a true Pythagorean, because in VA Apollonius' knowledge does not play any role.

ing to, Apollonius' legend had been held by Syria, and there by Antioch, the city linked to the fortunes of the historical Apollonius. A close relationship between southern Syria and Cappadocia and Cilicia, the regions which retained the memory on Apollonius as a magician and doctor, had a considerable significance as well. Yet it is difficult to ascertain why Antioch became the most faithful witness of Apollonius' legendary fortunes. It seems to have its roots in the fact that other centres of Apollonius' cult were suppressed by Christianity more promptly than Antioch; this religion was steadily acquiring power so as to prevail finally. At least, this happened to Aegaeae and to its temple of Apollonius — as will be discussed more thoroughly in the next chapter. By analogy we should expect that a similar fate befell Apollonius' sanctuaries at Tyana and Ephesus. In Syria, which was the cradle of Gnosis¹⁰¹, and especially in Antioch flourishing with numerous Gnostic sects, Apollonius found a lasting place of stay. It was there that he was linked up with the fortunes of Hermes Trismegistos. After all, Ammianus Marcellinus, a native Antiochian, was the first to state this in a clear and explicit way¹⁰². Thus most probably it was Antioch where the texts of popular Hermeticism, in which Apollonius or his pupil transmitted their revealed knowledge to men, instructed them in secret symbolism of the world of nature, in the structure and laws of the cosmos, and of the human soul, in the influence of the stars on individuals, and so on, had originated. The sources of these texts we found in Pseudo-Justin who, assuming a Christian position, defend Apollonius' magic and his

¹⁰¹ Cf. P. BROWN, *The Rise and Function of the holy Man in Late Antiquity*, *The Journal of Roman Studies* 61, 1971, pp. 80-101; RAC III, Bd 11 Lfg 84, col. 572-639.

¹⁰² It is possible that already Philostratus linked Apollonius with the stories derived from Hermeticism, because he made Apollonius take Δόξαι Πυθαγόρου from the cavern of Trophonius (VIII 29) Cf. Weisser, op. cit., p. 18 and note 68.

natural knowledge of the order of the world established by god. As the students of Arabic literature managed to prove *The Book of the Mystery of Creation*, a great Arabic philosophical and cosmogonic compendium which set the pattern for later alchemic considerations, is also of the Aramaic, but not of the Antiochian, origin. We are not surprised that Apollonius found a place in Arabic literature. When in the first half of the seventh century the Arabs conquered Syria, the region where Apollonius had won so much popularity, it was simply from there that he was transplanted to Arabic culture. Here he was introduced in to secret religious and occult literature of this nation.

It was also Antioch where Apollonius was known to the Church and to the Hellenes who defended pagan culture, and where talismans against small troublesome creatures, insects, and natural plagues were minutely described for the first time. This extremely interesting element of Apollonius' myth appears in almost all the sources which we have discussed in the present chapter. Thus we should conclude it by speculating on the origin of those talismans. As we have noticed, they began to appear suddenly and unexpectedly after Hierocles' anti-Christian attack. In the next chapter we shall analyse Hierocles' work more thoroughly in order to emphasize his significance in the development of Apollonius' legend. After all, Apollonius' talismans which made him known as "a man of talismans" remained unknown to Philostratus. Even Moiragenes, who was probably an Antiochian and who, if Philostratus is to be trusted (III 41), mentioned Apollonius' certain astro-magical work entitled *περὶ μαντείας ἀστέρων*¹⁰³, did not

¹⁰³ Philostratus mentions Apollonius' astrological wisdom several times (VA III 41; VII 33; VIII 7). We know Apollonius' letters to the Brahmins where he writes that thanks to them he acquired a knowledge which "allows to traverse the heavens" (Epp. Apoll. 77c) Cf. also Cramer, *Astrology in Roman Law*, op. cit., pp. 149-51 ff.; However, I do not know on what grounds Speyer, op.

hear about them. Our knowledge of Moiragnes allows us to state that although he wrote about Apollonius' magical gestures and performances, he did not describe his telesmatic achievements. In the third century, after Philostratus, they also remained unknown. We are fully entitled to assume that Apollonius' talismans were entirely a product of his legend fanned and elaborated by Hierocles who glorified Apollonius' thaumaturgic virtues. For the first time they were mentioned in a very general way by Eusebius who fought against Hierocles; in the same century they were accurately described by Pseudo-Justin.

As we have shown in chapter II, the cities which worshipped Apollonius and preserved his tradition flourished in the fourth century. It was only Lactantius who mentioned Apollonius' cult in Ephesus. As I shall show in the next chapter an inscription extolling Apollonius' merits and service for people was erected in Antioch. On the basis of this information which comes from post-Hieroclean times, perhaps it will not be too unfounded to assume that the talismans — magical statues — signed with the name of Apollonius were made and erected by the cities which once used to be the centres of Apollonius' cult, and later revived as such again thanks to Hierocles' propagandist work which contrasted Apollonius with Christ; this was the reason why their citizens wanted to commemorate the magician who had visited them, thus perpetuating memory of him in the East. It is also possible that the same wave of revived interest in the magician historically connected with the cities of Asia Minor and Syria gave rise to Apollonius' pseudoepigraphs, from among which only one, in Greek, has persisted till this day. According to C. Bonner, magical amulettes appeared along with the development of gnosis and

cit., p. 58, quotes without qualifications the view which traces the origin of the tradition on Apollonius' talismans back to Moiragenes.

were its by-product¹⁰⁴. This leads us to believe then that Apollonius was linked to hermeticism, already popular in Syria, in the cities which produced his talismans at that time¹⁰⁵.

Apollonius' talismans, which were most popular in Antioch, were also known in other cities of the East and even, according to the sources, in villages. This was touched upon by Malalas and Chronicon Paschale, whereas Cedrenos confirmed it. There is nothing strange in the fact that the second city where the talismans were well known was Byzantium, although Apollonius had never visited it. They came to the capital of the Eastern Empire probably from Syria which had become apart of the Roman Empire in 395 A.D. From the very beginning not only famous pieces of art began to flow to the new capital, but probably attractive objects, fetishes and amulets as well. Thus beneficial talismans might have been brought from Antioch; the talisman which once had been accepted by a certain sect of the Antiochian Church and which had won much popularity in the East. Pseudo-Codinos writes that Apollonius was even summoned to Constantinople by its founder Constantine the Great¹⁰⁶; others changed his legend still in a different way, claiming that he visited Byzantium in the times of Domitian, Nero, or Claudius. C. Mango reports that there were really various talismans in Byzantium¹⁰⁷, such as bronze figures against mosquitoes, fleas and bed-bugs. Thanks to a ceremonial called *στοιχεῖωσις* they acquired telesmatic power. As we remember from Cedrenos, Apollonius' magical performance

¹⁰⁴ *Magical Amulets*, Harvard Theological Review 39, 1946, pp. 25-26.

¹⁰⁵ L. Della Vida, op. cit., pp. 486-7; on Hermeticism in Mesopotamia transmitted there from Egypt cf. also Reitzenstein, *Hellenistische Wundererzählungen*, op. cit., pp. 128-29.

¹⁰⁶ *Patria Cpleos* II 103, p. 206 Preger.

¹⁰⁷ *Antique Statuary and the Byzantine Beholder*, Dumbarton Oaks Papers 17, 1963, pp. 55-75.

bore the same name and he himself had the cognomen στοιχειωματικός. Mango adds that the citizens of Byzantium had a strong faith in the effect of those figures - both intellectuals and commonalty believed in their power. This view agrees with the message of our sources. The authors whom we have quoted, even those who condemned talismans, believed in the influence of the talismanic objects. The sources we have mentioned enumerate materials from which those talismans were produced. As we remember they were made of stone, marble, or bronze. Pseudo-Justin stated in a general way that the needs determined the kind of material. *The Book of Wisdom* describes their appearance and the way they were produced. It tells us that for instance in order to make a talisman which would lure birds in one place, one should adopt the following methods: an appropriate bird should be formed from pure tin and then secret Hebrew names, accurately enumerated in the text¹⁰⁸, should be written on it. Probably Apollonius' other talismans bore similar signs. Yet the Byzantine authors do not mention them but describe the shape and impact of particular talismans. On the basis of the sources we know that those talismans existed till the ninth century, that is till the times when the Macedonian dynasty ascended the throne. Some of them (for example a bronze eagle in the hippodrome) existed in Byzantium till the crusades at the beginning of the thirteenth century¹⁰⁹.

Those products of Apollonius' beneficial magic which prove his knowledge of the influence of planets on earthly life and of the relationships in the cosmic sympathy came into being thanks to his legend. At the same time, however, they fit the image of the historical Apollonius. Both in his lifetime and in his legend Apollonius, whether a priest of

¹⁰⁸ Nau, *Apotelesmata Apollonii Tyanensis*, op. cit., p. 1388.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Dulière, op. cit., p. 259; 263; 265; 293.

Asclepios and a prophet, or a giver of talismans, was a benefactor of mankind. His links with Hermes Trismegistos may be seen as a continuation of his relationship with Asclepios, whereas his delivering people from plagues, as an expansions of the Asclepeian healing motif. In his whole legendary and real history Apollonius, both admired and condemned as a mere charlatan, always carried on his mission so concisely recorded in the Adana inscription: θνητῶν ἐξελάσει πόνους.

CHAPTER IV

APOLLONIUS' PHILOSOPHY

Although the tradition on Apollonius' healing, prophecies and talismans is spread over in time, and steeped in legend and historical mystery, its essence is homogeneous. We have pointed out its strong long-lasting connections with the Greek East and with the cities which were visited by the historical Apollonius. We discussed all the Greek authors, beginning with Lucian and ending with the late Byzantine writers, who had noted legends and information on Apollonius. As we shall see in this chapter, Apollonius' original philosophical thought was known also only to the Greek intellectuals from the East. What we learn from Philostratus about Apollonius' philosophical views is inadequate and strays from the historical truth. The only work which allows us to speculate on Apollonius' philosophy is a fragment of *περὶ θυσιῶν* strongly connected with the name of Apollonius and quoted in a few reliable sources. Ostensibly, it is the only historically accurate fragment of Apollonius' work which has persisted till our times, despite the fact that according to the ancient tradition Apollonius was supposedly the author of numerous works on various subjects. We have mentioned them in the present work several times, whenever our considerations required it. Before I discuss Apollonius' *περὶ θυσιῶν*, I would like to examine all accounts of Apollonius' work once again in a thorough and systematic way. Philostratus mentions their titles in several fragments of VA.

In *Suda Lexicon* those works are included on a separate

list¹. Generally, it repeats information contained in VA. Thus we learn from VA that Apollonius was the author of: 1) letters (Ἐπιστολαί I 2; VIII 19); 2) an astrological work in four books (Περὶ μαντείας ἀστέρων III 41); 3) a treatise on sacrifices (Περὶ θυσιῶν III 41; IV 19); 4) a work on Pythagoras' views (Δόξαι Πυθαγόρου VIII 19); 5) a hymn in praise of memory Ὑμνος εἰς Μνημοσύνην I 14); 6) a testament written in Ionic dialect (Διαθήκη VII 35); 7) a speech in which he defends himself delivered before Domitian (Ἀπολογία VIII).

In *Suda Lexicon* the treatise Περὶ θυσιῶν appears under the title of Τελεταὶ ἢ περὶ θυσιῶν, whereas the astrological work remains totally unknown to the authors of the lexicon. According to Meyer² it is replaced here by a work Χρησμοί. Del Corno³ holds that those Χρησμοί might have been a Byzantine fabrication, later added to the collection of Apollonius' works. For unknown reasons *Suda Lexicon* also does not mention Δόξαι Πυθαγόρου which Apollonius took away from Trophonius' cavern in Lebadeia (VIII 19). As we know, together with some of Apollonius' letters subsequently it became a part of Hadrian's library in Antium (VIII 20).

However, *Suda Lexicon* provides us with a very important piece of information. We learn that Apollonius was the author of a *Life of Pythagoras* (Πυθαγόρου βίος)⁴.

The studies on the authenticity of Apollonius' *Vita Pythagorae* and on its role in the course of the Pythagorean legend have a long history. They found a sufficient stimulus

¹ *Suidae Lexicon*, s.v. Ἀπολλώνιος (p. 307, Adler).

² *Apollonius von Tyana*, op. cit., p. 389.

³ *Vita di Apollonio*, op. cit., p. 44 and 50, note 73.

⁴ Meyer (op. cit., p. 390, note 2) holds that Apollonius' VP appears in Philostratus under the name of Δόξαι Πυθαγόρου Grosso (op. cit., p. 335) thinks that in VA VIII 7 we find a reference to Apollonius' VP despite the fact that Philostratus does not refer to his source.

in the fact that first Porphyry⁵ casually, and then Iamblichus⁶ more thoroughly, referred to Apollonius' VP as the source of their biographies of Pythagoras.

It was E. Rhode⁷ who initiated the studies on the sources of biographies on Pythagoras published in the times of the Empire. First of all he analysed the sources of Iamblichus' VP. He found out that in his biographical work Iamblichus had relied upon several authors, among them also Apollonius. According to Rhode, it was Apollonius who supplied Iamblichus with all materials which he required to describe unusual, miraculous and fantastic events from Pythagoras' life.

Rhode's studies were continued by I. Lévy⁸ who devoted several of his works to the history of Pythagorean biographies. There he gave much space to considerations of Apollonius' VP. Lévy not only believes in the authenticity of Apollonius' VP, but also assumes that beside the work written by Nicomachus of Gerasa, it was a basic source of Pythagorean biography in late Roman times. Moreover, Lévy considerably expanded the view once adopted by Meyer⁹ that when writing Apollonius' biography Philostratus utilized his *Life of Pythagoras*, choosing those of its fragments which he required for the

⁵ *Vita Pythagoraea*. It is commonly believed that Porphyry's mention about Apollonius' VP does not prove at the same time that he directly utilized this source (see H. JÄGER, *Die Quellen des Porphyrios in seiner Pythagoras-Biographie*, Diss. Zurich 1919, pp. 30-34; J. HEMPEL, *Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung von Apollonius von Tyana*, Leipzig 1920, p. 5; I. LÉVY, *Recherches sur les Sources de la Légende de Pythagore*, op. cit., p. 92; 109).

⁶ *De Vita Pythagorica* 35; 254-64.

⁷ *Die Quellen des Iamblichus in seiner Biographie des Pythagoras*, Rheinisches Museum 26, 1871, pp. 554-76 and 27 1872, pp. 23-61.

⁸ *Recherches*, op. cit., pp. 104-10, 123 ff. and passim; *La légende de Pythagore*, op. cit., pp. 1-78.

⁹ Op. cit., p. 383 n. Also Ghezzi repeats this view in *Apollonio di Tiana nella Storia e nella Leggenda*, op. cit., p. 371.

hagiography of his hero¹⁰. According to Lévy, Philostratus' biographical work should be treated as an evident pastiche of Apollonius' VP, which Philostratus enriched with information he derived from many other sources on Apollonius.

The authors of more recent works on the literary and historical origin of VA treat Lévy's views critically. Taggart¹¹ assumes that a short and vague mention of Apollonius' VP contained in Iamblichus indicates that Apollonius was only a secondary biographer of Pythagoras and that in Pythagorean doxographic tradition his work was of minor importance. Bowie¹² suggests undertaking new studies on the authenticity of Apollonius' VP, and on its links with Roman biographies and with Philostratus' VA. Besides, Bowie frames an altogether new hypothesis which traces a conceivable source of Iamblichus' VP back to a certain pseudoepigraphic *Life of Pythagoras*, compiled on the basis of Philostratus' VA and ascribed to Apollonius.

The problem of the authorship and authenticity of Apollonius' VP will remain unresolved for ever¹³. Having at our disposal only two mentions and surmises, we are not able to reconstruct Apollonius' VP nor to state to what degree it did influence the literary shape of VA. If we accept that both Porphyry and Iamblichus referred to a genuine *Life of Pythagoras* written by Apollonius of Tyana, and that Iamblichus utilized it to a great extent, than Lévy's speculations and his reconstruction of Apollonius' VP in

¹⁰ *Recherches*, op. cit., pp. 130-37.

¹¹ *Apollonius of Tyana*, op. cit. pp. 85-87. Taggart holds that Porphyry did not utilize Apollonius' VP. He also claims that we have too few proofs to maintain that an Apollonius referred to by Iamblichus is the Apollonius of Tyana. However, Taggart errs here: in other sources also Apollonius appears under his first name only. Besides, the context enables us to assume that we are dealing with *the* Apollonius.

¹² Op. cit., p. 1672, note 77.

¹³ The development of the studies on Apollonius' VP (up to 1970) is presented by Petzke, *Die Traditionen*, op. cit., pp. 37-40.

Recherches sur les Sources de la Légende de Pythagore and in *La Légende de Pythagore de Grèce en Palestine* must be acknowledged as sound.

Yet it is difficult to follow Lévy in his view that there is much to be said for Apollonius as the author of VP. However, it is equally difficult to agree fully with Rhode's and Taggart's hypotheses. The fact that Porphyry quotes Apollonius as his source has a great significance. Porphyry was an expert in Apollonius' work and life. It was he who preserved a fragment of *Περὶ θουσιῶν* and a fragment of Apollonius' letter in *De Styge*¹⁴. As we remember, it was also he who remembered the story of a magician who had understood the language of the birds and referred to Apollonius in his work *Contra Christianos*. In my opinion, Porphyry, as the author who mentions Apollonius, is to be trusted more than Iamblichus, albeit the latter several times quotes Apollonius as a source of his VP. In Iamblichus' other works Apollonius' name is not even mentioned¹⁵.

Finally, in order to justify partly Apollonius' VP we should add that the writing of biographies of the sage of Croton, and posing as Pythagoras was popular among neo-Pythagoreans. Nicomachus of Gerasa, almost of the same age as Apollonius, wrote the *Life of Pythagoras*¹⁶. Another Pythagorean, Moderatus of Gades, Apollonius' contem-

¹⁴ Cf. Penella, *The Letters*, op. cit., p. 3; Epp. Apoll. 78.

¹⁵ On the other hand, Iamblichus, as Porphyry's pupil, might have known Apollonius' figure very well, and might have been interested in his Pythagoreanism and in his fancy for the wisdom of the East. Iamblichus (died in 330 A.D.) taught in Syrian Apameia which was the homeland of philosophers. Both Posidonius and the neo-Pythagorean Numenius were born there. The city witnessed the development of a strong Hellenic opposition against Christianity. Its inhabitants worshipped the sun, practised sorcery and thaumaturgy, and were engaged in mystic cults. Apollonius' figure would fit these circles very well (cf. J. GEFFCKEN, *Der Ausgang des griechisch-Römischen Heidentums*, Religionswissenschaftliche Bibliothek 16, Heidelberg 1929, 158 f.).

¹⁶ Dillon, *The Middle Platonists*, op. cit., p. 353.

porary, was like Apollonius himself a living incarnation of Pythagoras. Numenius of Apameia, a neo-Pythagorean of the second half of the second century A.D., followed Pythagoras in his admiration for the wisdom of the East, where he found the roots of the Greek *sophia*¹⁷.

So all well-known Pythagoreans of the early Empire either wrote on Pythagoras or imitated him. In Philostratus, Apollonius is a hero of a book which is certain to belong to a series of Pythagorean legends¹⁸, whereas the historical Apollonius might have been the author of the *Life of Pythagoras*, and of other works.

We shall not deal with Apollonius' letters separately, because we constantly refer to them in the present work. Already in the Introduction we declared that we should utilize Penella's and Bowie's views on the origin of the letters¹⁹. We only expand and supplement them. Following the assumptions of those scholars on an early origin of certain letters, several times we have confirmed Bowie's theory on a pre-Philostratean origin of the letters addressed to Euphrates. We referred to those letters to document our views on the history of Apollonius' life and beliefs. We managed to attach a few other letters to their pre-Philostratean collection. Penella's data allowed us to choose Epp. Apoll 58 as an especially original one. This letter

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 361 ff.

¹⁸ Recently G. Anderson expressed his interesting remarks on the affinity of VA with the Pythagorean literature in *Studies in Lucian's comic Fiction*, Leiden 1976, pp. 89-94.

¹⁹ It should be added that recently also F. Lo Cascio approached, though not very successfully, the problem of the authenticity of Apollonius' letters in *Sulla Autenticità delle Epistole di Apollonio Tiano*, Palermo 1978 (Istituto Siciliano di Studi Bizantine e Neoellenici, Quaderni 10; Ristampa dagli Atti dell'Accademia di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti di Palermo, vol. XXXVI, parte II, 1978). On the other hand, Jones' paper *Martyria for Apollonius of Tyana*, op. cit., which we have mentioned several times, is a great achievement in the studies of Apollonius' letters.

appeared to be particularly useful in the studies on the historical value. It serves here as one of the basic sources for the reconstruction of Apollonius' philosophy.

Bowie included a group of letters addressed to the Greek cities in the pre-Philostratean collection. We assume that the letters where Apollonius expresses his disillusionment with public appearances (Epp. Apoll. 10 and 34) and also Epp. Apoll. 44, definitely of a Stoic character, were written in the second century because they mirror its ideas. Too the pre-Philostratean fabricators we also attributed both a letter addressed to Sparta (Epp. Apoll. 62) which faithfully pictures political relations in that city in the second century, and Epp. Apoll. 23 where Apollonius, as in Maximus of Aegaeae, explains why he chose Asclepios' medicin. We suggested a pre-Philostratean origin also in the case of some other letters.

Following Penella I assume that a certain group of letters might have been invented in the fourth century, during the period of revived interest in Hellenic symbolism and of polemics between Christians and pagans over Apollonius. I shall return to this view first given by Penella in chapter V.

Two other minor works of Apollonius ("Ὑμνος εἰς Μνημοσύνην and Διαθήκη) were most probalby invented by Philostratus, whereas Ἀπολογία is a rhetorical performance delivered by this sophist himself²⁰.

The pseudoepigraphical works which we discussed in the previous chapter constitute a separate group among the writings connected with Apollonius' name. We had to discuss them in order to point out the continuity of Apollonius' tradition among the Greeks of the East. However, I did not analyse them in detail since I lack the qualifications of the Oriental philologist. Syrian and Arabic

²⁰ Cf. Grosso, *op. cit.*, p. 484, note 125.

tradition of Apollonius awaits synthetic and professional studies. As I have mentioned in the Introduction, recently much has been done in this direction.

Eusebius of Caesarea²¹ in his *Praeparatio Evangelica* (IV 13) quotes a fragment from the work *Περὶ θυσιῶν* which he ascribes to Apollonius of Tyana. Eusebius was well acquainted with the figure of the Cappadocian philosopher. It is also clear that he was certain that Apollonius would be well known to the reader of his book. Besides, he calls him: αὐτὸς ἐκεῖνος ὁ Τυανεύς Ἀπολλώνιος. A text with a similar content is included also in Porphyry's *De Abstinencia* (II 34)²². However, Porphyry does not name the author of this text. He only states that he writes on the basis of what was said by "a certain wise man" (ὥς τις ἀνὴρ σοφὸς ἔφη). Yet we can learn the name of this wise man from Eusebius' *Demonstratio Evangelica* (III 3,11)²³ where Eusebius quotes the text contained in *De Abstinencia*. It was also Philostratus who referred to Apollonius' treatise in VA (III 41; IV 19); at the same time he admits that he knows this text at second hand, that is from Damis' account. Furthermore, as we remember, the existence of this work is confirmed in *Suda Lexicon* where it appears under the title of Τελεταὶ ἢ περὶ θυσιῶν.

E. Norden²⁴, who once studied the problem of the origin and history of the fragment contained in Eusebius and in Porphyry, came to the conclusion that in *De Abst.*

²¹ Praep. Evang. IV 13 Mras; in the studies of the history of philosophy in the Roman Empire Apollonius of Tyana's thought is usually left out, as it is for example in the case of A.H. ARMSTRONG'S *The Cambridge History of later Greek and early Medieval Philosophy*, Cambridge 1967, p. 105 note 4, and of Dillon's *A Study of Platonism*, op. cit., p. 341 where Dillon explains that: "I will not deal here with that remarkable figure of Apollonius of Tyana, interesting though he is, since he was much more of a prophet than a philosopher".

²² *De Abstinencia* II, 30-34 Bouffartique and Patillon.

²³ *Dem. Ev.* III 3, 11 Heikel.

²⁴ *Agnostos Theos*, op. cit., pp. 343-44.

Porphry paraphrased the text which he had previously included in his other work in its original form along with the name of its autor. After all, Porphry did not stray here from his usual manner. He liked repeating the same quotations in his various works dropping the name of their authors in his subsequent versions²⁵. At the same time he used to distort the content of the original without taking the trouble of checking it again. It did not occur to him, too, that his works could get lost and that the future reader of what has managed to survive would not be able to establish the authorship of the fragments quoted.

According to Norden, it was just this lost work of Porphry containing a quotation from Apollonius' treatise that was utilized by Eusebius. He faithfully and accurately rewrote the fragment and also copied the data of the title and the authorship of the work entitled *On Sacrifices*. Trying to be as precise as possible Eusebius admitted that he did not use Apollonius' book as his first hand source: ὁ Τυανεύς Ἀπολλώνιος γράφειν τοιαῦτα λέγεται. Furthermore, he acknowledges that what Apollonius writes about a transcendental god is close to Porphry's view on god, suggesting at the same time that Porphry quoted Apollonius' thoughts because he took a fancy to them. One might conclude then that Porphry expressed his own views disguising himself as a well-known theologian from Tyana. It does not seem probable, because *Περὶ θυσιῶν* was commonly ascribed to Apollonius in Porphry's times. Well-educated Porphry would not like to pretend to have been the author of the work in order to avoid being ridiculed. So if, according to modern views²⁶, *Περὶ θυσιῶν* is a literary fabrication, it must have been forged much earlier, already in

²⁵ Ibid., p. 344.

²⁶ Bowie, op. cit., p. 1685 note 131.

pre-Philostratan times, because Philostratus himself knew its title and attributed the work to Apollonius.

Now is it not plausible that *Περὶ θυσιῶν* is a genuine text written by Apollonius? In the light of the accessible sources it is difficult to provide a positive answer for this question. That is why we should rather formulate a question which is easier to answer: what is the historical image of Apollonius the philosopher as seen against the background of the sources? Obviously, one cannot determine to what degree this image is a faithful portrait of Apollonius. Moreover, to render this historical image of Apollonius the thinker we should pay particular attention to its cohesion and take into consideration as many sources as possible.

In my opinion, so far historians have tended to overlook the thoughts contained in works ascribed to Apollonius. They regarded them as material useful rather to philosophers. Yet I think that thanks to the analysis of Apollonius' philosophical views we can make considerable progress in the studies of the historical Apollonius.

Both Porphyry and Eusebius hold a high opinion of Apollonius' philosophy, and both show interest in him in their other works. Writing about Apollonius Porphyry calls him ἀνὴρ φιλοσοφία πάσῃ κεκοσμημένος²⁷ and refers to various sources which mention him²⁸. Eusebius made Apollonius a hero of his apologetic treatise *Contra Hieroclem*. Moreover, both Eusebius and especially Porphyry were experts in Platonism and their works are a repository of unique Middle Platonic and neo-Pythagorean texts. For instance, Eusebius quotes fragments of the works

²⁷ Harnack, op. cit., fragment 60, p. 83.

²⁸ Cf. Supra p. 136 of the present chapter. According to H. LEWY, *Chaldean Oracles and Theurgy*, contained in *Praep. Evang.* (IV 5, 1-2 Mras). Probably following Apollonius Porphyry introduces here a notion of god raised above everything which is spiritual and material: ὁ ἐπὶ πᾶσαι θεός (*De Abs.* II 34).

written by Numenius of Apameia and Atticus²⁹, whereas Porphyry, who studied the history of Platonism and Pythagoreanism at Plotynus' school, preserved the thoughts of Nicomachus of Gerasa, Numenius of Apameia, Cronius, Chaeremon, and of others³⁰.

As I have already mentioned, Apollonius' philosophical speculations on god comprised in *Περὶ θυσιῶν* were highly valued by Eusebius. Here Apollonius considers god the first and only being, separated from the rest of creation (*πρῶτος; ἕν; ὄντι κεχωρισμένῳ πάντων; ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός*), understood as a pure thinking (*νοῦς δὲ ἔστιν οὗτος, ὀργάνου μὴ δεόμενος*), and as the being exceeding other beings in its beauty (*τοῦ καλλίστου τῶν ὄντων*); such a notion of god exemplifies the pagan attitude which paved the way for Christian doctrine. Also Apollonius' unfriendly attitude towards offering up sacrifices to god brought him closer to Christianity³¹.

In *Περὶ θυσιῶν* Apollonius tries to prove that god who remains outside the world of senses does not need anything

²⁹ Cf. Numénus, *Fragments*, Paris 1973, p. 7 and 9; 28-32; (éd. des Places); Armstrong, *The Cambridge History ...*, op. cit., p. 73.

³⁰ Cf. J. BIDEZ, *Vie de Porphyre, le Philosophe néo-platonicien*, Gand-Leipzig 1913, pp. 9-10.

³¹ Apollonius' suggestions as to the form of the cult of god might have influenced also St. Augustine. In *De Civitate Dei* (XIX 23, Dombart) he writes: *Nam Deus quidem, utpote omnium Pater, nullius indiget; sed nobis est bene, cum eum per iustitiam et castitatem aliasque virtutes adoramus, ipsam vitam precem ad ipsum facientes per imitationem et inquisitionem de ipso*. J.O'Meara, a student of Porphyry's literary output, holds that here St. Augustine utilized a thought contained in Porphyry's treatise *Περὶ τῆς ἐκ λογίων φιλοσοφίας* (*Philosophy from Oracles*) preserved in fragments (*Porphyry's Philosophy from Oracles in Augustine*, Études Augustienne, Paris 1959, p. 169 n.). At the same time, O'Meara shows parallels between St. Augustine's text and *De Abst.* II 34. It follows then that the work from which Eusebius derived a fragment of *περὶ θυσιῶν* and which Norden tried to trace is the very *Philosophy from Oracle*. R.P. FESTUGIÈRE, *Corpus Hermeticum*, Paris 1945, II, p. 352 note 34 holds that the notion of god contained in a hermetic work *Asclepius* comes from Apollonius' *Περὶ θυσιῶν*. Festugière dates *Asclepius* at the second or third centuries A.D.

of earthly origin. He neither enjoys incense nor fruits of the earth. None of the earthly names fits his nature. People's prayers do not reach him. God, who is pure reason, does not need any of sensual objects, nor does he await earthly adoration. The only faculty which allows people to communicate with the most beautiful being among all beings, is reason, which is also the most beautiful element in human beings: (δία τοῦ καλλίστου τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν αἰτοίη τἀγαθά). Man's only duty to god consists in his turning the mind towards the supernatural good and in showing to god his own perfection (μόνῳ δὲ χρῶτο πρὸς αὐτὸν αἰεὶ τῷ κρείττονι λόγῳ).

The theology in this fragment appears to be very interesting. According to Taggart³², it allows a place to be found for Apollonius among Middle Platonic philosophers of the first and second centuries A.D. Those philosophers, who flourished in the second century³³, understood god as a Pythagorean Monad, raised above other beings, and as the highest intelligence³⁴. Such a notion of god we find in Nicomachus of Gerasa, Moderatus of Gades, Numenius of Apameia, Albinus, and in others³⁵. In Albinus' theology god has the same name as in Apollonius: πρῶτος νοῦς τὸ καλόν, τὸ ἀγαθόν³⁶.

Apollonius' notion of matter as the absence of good and the seat of pollution³⁷: οὐδ' ἔστιν ὃ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀνίησι γῆ

³² *Apollonius of Tyana*, op. cit. 95.

³³ Dillon, op. cit. pp. 231-2; 341.

³⁴ Ibid., chapter IV; V; VII (passim). U. von Wilamowitz - Moellendorf, *Der Glaube der Hellenen*, Berlin 1932, II, p. 488, notices the affinity between Apollonius' notion of god and that provided by the neo-Pythagorean Onatas (cf. Norden, *Agnostos...* op. cit., p. 39 note 4). However, this information is none too useful for the dating of Apollonius' treatise, as we do not know when Onatas lived and wrote.

³⁵ Cf. Armstrong, op. cit., pp. 53-83 (passim).

³⁶ Cf. Taggart, op. cit., pp. 96-7; R.E. WITT, *Albinus and the History of Middle Platonism*, Cambridge 1937, pp. 127-28.

³⁷ Taggart, op. cit., p. 98.

φυτὸν ἢ τρέφει ξῶον, ἢ ἄνθρωπος, ὃ μὴ πρὸς αὐτὸν γέ τι μίasma
also fits neo-Pythagorean and Middle Platonic mysticism. Like all the philosophers following this trend, Apollonius hierarchises the beings in the cosmos: introduces gods who descend from the highest god: μεθ'ὃν γνωρίζεσθαι τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀναγκαῖον and he believes in the existence of the demi-gods demons³⁸. Besides, Apollonius remains under the influence of Stoicism, for he attaches a great importance to human reason as a vehicle of cognition, which turns man to the source of beauty and good³⁹.

Historically, the theology of Apollonius' work appears to be extremely interesting. It is completely at variance with what Philostratus tells us about Apollonius' theological views.

Under the veil of Damis, Philostratus states that in his book Apollonius provided information on how to offer up sacrifices to particular gods (III 41), and discussed typology of material sacrifices, libations and prayers which gods find most appealing. Moreover, he enumerated the hours of days and nights which were most appropriate for offering up sacrifices and for gaining the gods' favour (IV 19). All that clearly shows that Philostratus did not know Apollonius' work. He invented its content, and his version is incompatible with the content of the preserved fragment. Besides, he ascribed his inventions to Damis - also a fictitious figure⁴⁰.

However, when reading VA it might appear that Philostratus was familiar with Apollonius' notion of god.

³⁸ Here Apollonius writes about beings better than human beings which he calls κρείττονες. Taggart claims (p. 98) that this denotes a neo-Pythagorean notion of demons. On demonology in Middle Platonism and neo-Pythagoreanism, cf. Lewy, *The Chaldean...*, op. cit. pp. 216 ff.; 497-508.

³⁹ J. LEGOWICZ, *Historia filozofii starożytnej Grecji i Rzymu*, Warszawa 1973, p. 7.

⁴⁰ Cf. Chap. I, p. 26 f.

Yet in fact this is only an illusion. Like every humanist, Philostratus was acquainted with the philosophical trends predominant in his times. Thus he introduced to VA simplified Middle Platonic and neo-Pythagorean notions. That is why we find in VA a discourse on a hierarchic structure of the beings in the universe (III 35), vulgarized Platonic and Pythagorean considerations on the soul of the world (III 34), and numerous figures of demons and heroes. The latter occupy much space in Philostratus' work as they add colour to its fabulous world. Yet it is difficult to discern Apollonius' thought among all these literary trimmings⁴¹.

Clearly, what Philostratus really needed for propagandistic ends was the figure of a Pythagorean "saint" rather than of an eclectic philosopher - which Apollonius really had been. His attitude towards Apollonius' philosophy was the same as to Apollonius' religious views. Philostratus put much effort into making his hero resemble Pythagoras himself, but at the same time he did not take the trouble to render his philosophy faithfully. His "Pythagoras" of late Hellenism is a divine man seen through a prism of his own heroic virtues but not of a philosophical tradition. That is why the principles of Apollonius' Pythagorean philosophy are limited to a few moral and religious ones, which were to free soul from the bonds of flesh (e.g. VA I 1; VI 11; VIII 7). Among those principles we find a belief in metempsychosis connected with a command to wear linen clothes; bloody sacrifices are replaced by bloodless material ones, and a command to abstain from meat goes hand in hand with antisexualism and with abstaining from wine, hot baths and haircuts. Finally, a Philostratean Pythagorean is obliged to keep silence for five years⁴². Apart from a few rather

⁴¹ For instance, it was attempted by Petzke, *Die Traditionen*, op. cit., p. 197 ff., who by all means tries to make VA resemble the Gospel.

⁴² Taggart, op. cit., pp. 142-68 collects and discusses all the attributes of a Pythagorean saint in Philostratus.

superficial metaphysical views, VA does not contain typical neo-Pythagorean speculations on the First Principle, on the Demiurge, the Monad and the Dyad, neither does it provide a classification of the beings or a collection of opposites. We would not find here any references to numerical symbolism, or to music and the harmony of the spheres⁴³. Tendencies to mathematicize reality — so strong in neo-Pythagoreanism — do not find their expression in VA.

Despite adopting such an attitude Philostratus refers to Apollonius' eclecticism in very general terms. In VA I 7 he repeats what he read in Maximus of Aegaeae that during his studies in Asclepios' temple in Aegaeae Apollonius pursued the teachings of Platonic, Stoic and Peripatetic philosophy. Also on the basis of Maximus he tells us that in Aegaeae Apollonius finally made a Pythagorean ἀίρεσις, after previous extensive philosophical studies. Furthermore, Philostratus made Apollonius deliver a Platonic homily at Smyrna (IV 8;9) and a lecture on the immortality of soul which echoed Plato's arguments put forward in *Timaeus* (VI 22). Also at Smyrna Apollonius discussed fate and destiny (VII 8). As we have already written, it is possible that apart from Ephesus, Apollonius visited Smyrna and foretold an earthquake there (IV 6-9). The philosophical centre of Smyrna, famous in the second century, and its Asclepeion might have attracted Apollonius.

In a similar way to Moiragenes, Maximus presented Apollonius as a healer, magician and philosopher⁴⁴. Obviously, he was not as accurate as Moiragenes who showed Apollonius as engaged in a conflict with the philosophers of his time. Unfortunately, the fragments of his work which he devoted to discussing Apollonius' philosophical principles have not managed to survive till this day. So besides Περὶ

⁴³ Cf. Dillon, op. cit., pp. 341-83.

⁴⁴ Cf. Chap. II, p. 62 f.

Θυσιῶν the best representation of Apollonius the philosopher is contained in Epp. Apoll. 58. While reading this letter we feel that it was written by the same author who wrote Περὶ θυσιῶν. Unless it was written by Apollonius himself, which appears to be highly probable⁴⁵, then its author must have remained under a direct influence of his personality. There are no doubts that the letter originated in the pre-Philostratean times. As we have already mentioned, it seems to be the philosophers' profession of faith.

We cannot agree with W. Scott's statement⁴⁶ that this letter contains Apollonius' Stoic views. Although there are some references to Stoicism (similarly, in Περὶ θυσιῶν) and to Aristotelianism, yet its leading argument is Middle Platonic in its character.

It is in accordance with the spirit of this philosophy that Apollonius consoles one Valerius (probably a proconsul of Asia, Valerius Asiaticus)⁴⁷, who sank into despair after his son's death, and could not find comfort. In his consolatory letter Apollonius explains to him that as man's birth is a transition from οὐσία to φύσις, so his death is a liberation from φύσις to οὐσία. Apollonius tells the disheartened father that death is a return to god of what was merely a human being, that it is a change of nature, of human essence: φύσις but not of a place: τόπος. Through death the human element turns into the divine one, so it is not a mere displacement of man from the earth to Hades. A divine element in man loses its human frame and turns into pure divinity. While discussing the changes in the movements of things Apollonius promotes the view well known from *Phaedo* that soul is the source of movement⁴⁸, and uses a Platonic argument for merging soul

⁴⁵ Cf. Chap. I, p. 33.

⁴⁶ *Hermetica*, Oxford 1925, II, p. 191.

⁴⁷ Cf. Chap. I, p. 33-34; Penella, op. cit., pp. 119-20.

⁴⁸ 80d - 82c.

into flesh ⁴⁹. We should also remember that in the letters (Epp. Apoll. 17) Apollonius understood magic as a Platonic teaching.

We do not know if Philostratus knew Epp. Apoll. 58. This letter was preserved in a separate epistolary collection ⁵⁰. Probably both this letter and *Περὶ θυσιῶν* belong to a part of Apollonius' tradition which remained beyond Philostratus' access. Besides, the image of Apollonius it provided does not fit Philostratus' tendency.

In VA Apollonius is shown as an inspired man who used to visit various cult centers of the Empire. Wherever he went he studied the history and origin of local cults (I 2; 16; VIII 7; 7). He talked to the priests and pointed out where they had infringed tradition (IV 19; VI 19), and he enlightened them about what sculptures and altars should be dedicated to gods (IV 1). Fulfilling his duty Apollonius visited almost all Greek temples (IV 24; V 20). In some of the sanctuaries in Greece, Asia Minor and Syria he made his stays longer, showing a special interest for local beliefs (I 8; 16; III 58; IV 11; 13; 14; 18; 34; VI 40; VIII 17; 19; 30). He paid visits to all the temples in Egypt (V 34), whereas in Alexandria he came to Serapeum (V 25). His activities are impressive, but only in Philostratus' imagination. As Bowie ⁵¹ rightly suggested they do not find any confirmation in literary or epigraphical sources contemporary to Apollonius, to Philostratus, or pertaining to the late antique times.

Bowie concludes then that since Apollonius' reformatory activities were invented by Philostratus, so also *Περὶ θυσιῶν* is a fabrication in no way connected with the historical Apollonius. It was put into circulation under the name of

⁴⁹ *Meno* 81 a-d; *Respublica* 620 a-b.

⁵⁰ Penella, op. cit., p. 2; 4 f.

⁵¹ Bowie, op. cit., p. 1689.

Apollonius already before Philostratus (maybe by Maximus of Aegaeae⁵², who wrote about Apollonius' interest in cults and sacrifices in VA I 11), in order to provide Apollonius with the reputation and fame which he lacked in the Greek world.

However, here we should oppose Bowie's views. Having been probably misled by the title of the work, Bowie supposed that its author would go into various ways of offering sacrifices, etc. That is why he linked this work to the Philostratean tradition according to which Apollonius appeared to be a typical pagan priest offering sacrifices.

Paradoxically, despite its title *On Sacrifices* Apollonius' work does not discuss them. On the contrary, it denies the need for them and presents its author as a sage professing eclecticism closely related to neo-Pythagoreanism. We can agree with Bowie that *Περὶ θυσιῶν* is a pseudoepigraph written by somebody who knew Apollonius' life and views well (maybe it was Maximus of Aegaeae himself). Yet Bowie erred because he did not read the preserved fragment of the work which, after all, would have provided him with an additional argument for his own thesis that the Philostratean Apollonius is a non-historical figure. Bowie did not notice that in *Περὶ θυσιῶν* we can find an Apollonius quite different from the Philostratean one. The latter, a propagator of such pure material sacrifices as incense (I 31; 32; VIII 7; 12, libations (IV 19), honey cakes (I 1) and also traditional sacrifices (V 43; VI 41), and an uncompromising opponent to bloody sacrifices (I 10; 31; V 25; VIII 7.12) here proclaims that god needs none of those sacrifices which in fact contradict his divinity. Philostratus holds that Apollonius' greatest novelty was to introduce prayer as the highest form of sacrifice (I 10; IV 40). Apollonius, who

⁵² Ibid., p. 1685.

in VA offers his prayer to the sun twice a day (II 38; VI 10; VII 11; 31; VIII 13), in *Περὶ θυσιῶν* renounces even this most elaborate cult sacrifice: λέγω δὲ τῷ μὴ διὰ στόματος ἰόντι.

Bowie did not take into consideration the fact that despite its title, Apollonius' treatise does not promote sacrifices but fights them. Bowie was deceived by Philostratus' fantasy. He ventured too far in his scepticism and allowed the Philostratean veil to overshadow a more historical Apollonius.

Other scholars, also taken in by Philostratus, believe that the historical Apollonius meant to reform a traditional system of pagan sacrifices⁵³. Still others think that it was Philostratus who was enthusiastic about reforming paganism and made Apollonius express his ideas⁵⁴.

It is possible that Apollonius really wanted to reform paganism, and because of that he promoted the views contained in *Περὶ θυσιῶν*. Yet in this respect his teachings were far from what Philostratus thought them to have been. It is also possible that this was the reason for his visits to several temples and for his talks with priests. What he discussed with them, however, was the cult of god void of material sacrifices⁵⁵.

⁵³ Cf. B. HARRIS, *Apollonius of Tyana: Fact and Fiction*, *The Journal of Religious History* 5, 3, 1969, p. 190; Mead, *Apollonius of Tyana*, op. cit., p. 12; 35, holds that Apollonius devoted his life to reviving cults whose existence in the Empire was threatened. Réville (*La Religion à Rome*, op. cit., pp. 220-27) expresses a similar view.

⁵⁴ Esser, *Formgeschichtliche Studien*, op. cit., p. 18 ff., assumes on dubious grounds that Philostratus relied on tradition and accounts preserved by various temples when he was travelling with the Empress through the Greco-Roman world; J. RÉVILLE, *Le Christ païen du troisième Siècle*, *Revue des deux Mondes* 59, 1865, p. 623, thought that Apollonius' religious cosmopolitanism had mirrored political cosmopolitanism prevailing in Philostratus' times; W. SMID, *Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern von Dionysus von Halikarnass bis auf den zweiten Philostratus*, Stuttgart 1896, IV, p. 569 ff.

⁵⁵ In *Dem. Evangelica* Eusebius calls Apollonius work *Theology*. This title

Such an Apollonius was known to, and praised by Eusebius. The Philostratean Apollonius was alien and even obnoxious to him, a feeling which he directly expressed in *Contra Hieroclem*. Here he attacks Philostratus' book which for him is a collection of lies and frauds. He does not inveigh against Apollonius, whom he reckons as a sage and a virtuous man also here (C.H.V), but against the image of Apollonius rendered by Philostratus. Eusebius thinks that the Philostratean Apollonius can be considered neither a philosopher nor a honest man (C.H. IV) What Eusebius has in mind are the descriptions of Apollonius' magical and thaumaturgic practices which, as produced by Philostratus, completely distort the image of the sage which Eusebius knew from *Περὶ θυσιῶν*.

By a happy coincidence, however, we have a text at our disposal which helps to solve the difficult problem of *Περὶ θυσιῶν*. It is again Apollonius' letter (Epp. Apoll. 26). In my opinion, it is a direct continuation of *Περὶ θυσιῶν*. It tells us that not only the first and highest god, but the gods do not need material sacrifices *θεοὶ θυσιῶν οὐ δέονται*. To give them pleasure man should only deepen his *φρόνησις* - moral wisdom. Moreover, Apollonius writes in his letter that the practice of offering sacrifices is followed by people without faith *ἄθέων*. *Φρόνησις* denotes the same as *λόγος* in *Περὶ θυσιῶν*. It is intellectual discrimination of positive values revealed by reason⁵⁶. Letting the gods see virtues which spring from reason is worthy only of a believer. All *θυσίαι* are unworthy of god and gods.

Thanks to Epp. Apoll. 26 we can attempt to reconstruct

is an additional proof that the work did not contain any rules of sacral offerings. Much to our surprise both Grosso, op. cit., p. 506, and Meyer, op. cit., p. 379, claim that Philostratus knew *Περὶ θυσιῶν* and that he repeated its content faithfully in VA IV 19.

⁵⁶ Cf. Marcus Aurelius, Med, I 8; V 26; V 14; Dio Chrysostom, Or. I 12; III 10; IV 70; Seneca, Epist. 85, 2; 90, 5.

the content of *Περὶ θυσιῶν* written by Apollonius of Tyana. Apart from the notion of god which had its roots in the mystical philosophy of the first and second centuries, that is in Middle Platonism and neo-Pythagoreanism, Apollonius' work contained views on sacrifices which should not be offered up to god and gods if one wanted to remain a truly religious man. It did not contain then, as Philostratus claims, any rules concerning *θυσίαι* but it denounced their usefulness. Possibly, it also discussed forms of traditional sacrifices in their historical development.

If Philostratus knew this work but did not admit it, he must have been aware that its potential pagan reader was likely to encounter serious difficulties with its understanding. That is why in VA Apollonius' religiousness is more plain and easier to carry out.

We cannot prove with absolute certainty that *Περὶ θυσιῶν* was written by Apollonius himself. Yet we are positive that it originated before Philostratus and is closely connected with the historical Apollonius. Probably it mirrors his views and thoughts, makes him adhere to the eclectic philosophical thought of the first and second centuries and links him with the letters which were invented also in his own times. Together with Epp. Apoll. 26 it presents him as an original critic of pagan religious practices.

Finally, we should consider Philostratus' statement once more. As we have already written, Philostratus did not know Apollonius' work. As an explanation he alleges that it was written in Apollonius' "own" language (*ἐν τῇ ἑαυτοῦ φωνῇ* IV, 19)⁵⁷. However, he saw it in numerous cities, temples,

⁵⁷ It is not known how this expression should be translated. It can also denote a special complicated way of speaking adopted by Apollonius. It would mean then that Philostratus knew *Περὶ θυσιῶν* and deceived the reader in order to prevent him from absorbing the intricacies of Apollonius' philosophy. The same refers to VA III 41 (Cf. Bowie, op. cit., p. 1677 note 90).

and in the houses of educated men (III 41). He also knew that it was written in the strain of Apollonius' speeches.

Apollonius' native language was Syrian and not Cappadocian, as Conybeare claims⁵⁸, because such a language did not exist: in the first century it was already Middle Aramaic⁵⁹ that was spoken in Cappadocia. If Philostratus is to be trusted, Apollonius' work might have been written in this language. The information that this work was written in Apollonius' vernacular is quite original and really explains why it remained inaccessible to Philostratus. This text might have originated and circulated in the East among Apollonius' admirers (after all, Apollonius was mainly connected with Tyana and Aegaeae and in Antioch). This view partially contradicts Bowie's hypothesis that the pseudoepigraph was written by Maximus of Aegaeae. However, it is possible that Maximus, as the inhabitant of Cilicia, might have known the Syrian language. In order to stress his unfamiliarity with this text and to authenticate his statement Philostratus claims that the text was known to Damis (III 41; IV 19), a Syrian from Niniveh (VA I 19).

If the text signed with the name of Apollonius was really known in Cappadocia and maybe in Syria, then there is nothing surprising in the fact that Porphyry, who knew Syrian and other Oriental languages⁶⁰, translated its fragments and quoted it in one of his works. It is also quite probable that the philosopher Euphrates might have come across this text which circulated in Syria and Cappadocia. He severely criticized it, whereas two centuries later Porphyry and Eusebius praised it. Pupils and admirers of

⁵⁸ Conybeare (in) VA vol. I, p. 321.

⁵⁹ Th. NÖLDEKE, *Die Orientalische Literatur, Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, Berlin-Leipzig 1906 I, VII, p. 104.

⁶⁰ Bidez, *Vie de Porphyre*, op. cit., p. 10.

the sage of Tyana who were active in the cities visited by Apollonius in his lifetime, described the conflict between both philosophers in the letters which Apollonius and Euphrates allegedly exchanged. This is the reason why almost all the letters addressed to Euphrates are full of praise for Pythagorean philosophy. Their fabricators simplified the whole matter and did not bother with going into subtle considerations on Apollonius' eclectic Platonic and Pythagorean thought. This attitude towards Apollonius' philosophy was later adopted by Philostratus whose romance — directed to an average reader — demanded plain and comprehensible philosophizing.

CHAPTER V

APOLLONIUS' LEGEND FROM HIEROCLES TO NICOMACHUS FLAVIANUS

The edict published in Nicomedia in 303 A.D.¹ marks the beginning of Diocletian's persecution of Christians. In 302 it was preceded by well-known events which took place at the emperor's court in Antioch.² One of the Antiochian advisers to the emperor, the then vicarius Orientis — Sossianus Hierocles³ — appeared to have been most hostile towards Christians. This sophist and Platonizing philosopher published an anti-Christian treatise, called in short *A Friend of the Truth* (Φιλαλήθης λόγος)⁴. Based on Philostratus' stories it was the next attack, after Celsus' and Porphyry's works, against the young Christian religion⁵.

The last decades of the same fourth century witnessed the rise of opposition among pagan senators in Rome who aimed at saving the culture and religion of the past. One of their most remarkable representatives was Virius Nicomachus Flavianus. He either translated Philostratus' VA into Latin or adopted it⁶, and joined the Emperor Eugenius when he launched his attack against the Christian Emperor Theodosius the Great. History linked both

¹ F. MILLER, *The Emperor in the Roman World*, op. cit., p. 574.

² T.D. BARNES, *Sossianus Hierocles and the Antecedents of the Great Persecution*, op. cit., p. 245.

³ PRLE, p. 432, Barnes, *ibid.*, p. 246.

⁴ As far the title of Hierocles' work is concerned cf. Barnes, *ibid.*, p. 242, note 15.

⁵ Barnes, op. cit., p. 241; Millar, op. cit., 573-74; Taggart, op. cit., p. 171.

⁶ Sidonius Apollinaris, *Epistulae* VIII 3, 1.

pagan intellectuals — Sossianus Hierocles and Nicomachus Flavianus — to the legend of Apollonius of Tyana. First let us discuss the former.

Hierocles' minor or major work (we do not know its "dimensions") attacking Christianity probably was published twice: first in 302 A.D., just before the persecutions, it was circulated mainly in Syria and Palestine; secondly in 303 in Nicomedia⁷. It was then that Hierocles settled in Nicomedia for good, as he had been dismissed from his vicar office and appointed a governor of Bithynia (*praeses Bithyniae*)⁸. In Nicomedia he read his book publicly. He was heard by Lactantius who at that time was a teacher of rhetoric in Nicomedia — the imperial "capital" of Diocletian⁹.

An apologetic treatise entitled *Against the Life of Apollonius of Tyana written by Philostratus, Occasioned by the Parallel Drawn by Hierocles between him and Christ (Contra Hieroclem)*, an extensive answer to *A Friend of the Truth*, appeared very soon, probably already before 303 A.D.¹⁰, just at the time when Hierocles compared Apollonius to Christ. As we know this treatise was written by Eusebius of Caesarea, a Father of the Church well known to us. Also Lactantius answered Hierocles in a brief but decisive way¹¹.

Eusebius' reaction to Hierocles' attack was vehement, as Hierocles' work was an exceptional and menacing phenomenon for the Church. Hierocles tried to combat Christ by promoting Apollonius, and he opposed the Gospel with Philostratus' *VA*. Eusebius, who knew the figure of

⁷ Barnes, *op. cit.*, p. 243.

⁸ On Hierocles' career see Barnes, *op. cit.*, pp. 243-45.

⁹ *Div. Inst.* V 4,1. On Lactantius' stay in Nicomedia cf. Millar, *op. cit.*, pp. 573-77.

¹⁰ Cf. Barnes, *op. cit.*, pp. 242-43.

¹¹ V 2, BRANDT, *De Mortibus Persecutorum* 16 Moreau.

Apollonius and particularly his philosophical views very well, understood that thanks to Hierocles' clever propaganda the magician and philosopher of Tyana could become a serious rival for Christ, just at the time when the Church was most vulnerable.

Lactantius' rendering of Hierocles' arguments, and several fragments of *A Friend of the Truth* contained in *Contra Hieroclem*, prove that Hierocles ridiculed the credulity of Christians who acknowledged Christ's divinity only because he worked miracles. According to Hierocles, as a wonder-worker Apollonius exceeded Christ but nobody acclaimed him as a god; he was only said to have been a friend of gods: ἀλλὰ θεοῖς κεχαρισμένον ἄνδρα ἡγούμεθα (C.H. II). Moreover, Hierocles attacked the crudity of Jesus' first apostles: Peter and Paul, and he ascribed to them charlatanry. Christ's other pupils he treated in a similar way, contrasting them with enlightened biographers of Apollonius: Maximus of Aegaeae, Philostratus, and Damis — "the philosopher". Thus he rated the literary culture of early Christians much lower than the Hellenic writings.

Eusebius did not go beyond those data¹². Lactantius adds that Hierocles described the young Christ as a ringleader of a band of robbers; moreover, he called him a mere magician, whereas he praised Apollonius' thaumaturgic arts¹³. Further, Lactantius tells us that in order to emphasize a difference between both wonder-workers Hierocles, like Porphyry, referred to a parallel between Apollonius' conduct at Domitian's court and Christ's attitude. Christ allowed himself to be crucified, whereas

¹² The subject matter of Eusebius' *Contra Hieroclem* is thoroughly dealt with by Taggart, op. cit., pp. 178-200, and by M. KERTSCH, *Traditionelle Rhetorik und Philosophie in Eusebius Antirrhetikos gegen Hierokles*, *Vigiliae Christianae* 32, 2, 1980, pp. 145-71.

¹³ *Div. Inst.* V 3 Brandt.

Apollonius only did not prevent his arrest by the tyrant. Lactantius himself acknowledged Apollonius' thaumaturgic gifts but thought them to have been rooted in impure powers. As a Father of the Church he referred to a Messianic doctrine to prove Christ's superiority over Apollonius. He held that Apollonius had not been foretold by the Jewish prophets, whereas it was Jesus who fulfilled their prophecies. He also argued that Jewish prophets took precedence over Greek philosopher and that Christian culture went with its roots far beyond the Mediterranean past. Christ, whose coming was foretold a thousand years ago, could not have been a mere magician. Only Apollonius appeared to have been such, resembling many others who were active in the East in the first centuries of our era.

In his defence of Christ Eusebius employed the same arguments as Lactantius. He defended Christ's miracles, his divinity and mission by referring to Jewish prophets (C.H. IV), and he explained Christ's descent to the earth by means of theological arguments. Eusebius argues that divinity belongs to the heavenly kingdom and it cannot be attributed to any man (and particularly to such an individual as Apollonius). However, it happens that God sends saviours to the earth "to save and redeem people" (C.H. 4-6). This was the case of Christ who descended to the earth as God. He worked miracles thanks to his divine powers, whereas Apollonius employed demons in his thaumaturgies (XXIV; XXV; XXVII and others). Lactantius attacks Apollonius himself, but Eusebius turns against his biographer. He analyses Philostratus' work book by book, pointing out its naivety, even facetiousness and fabulousness. He mocks at Apollonius' earlier biographers — Maximus of Aegaeae and Damis. Having analysed Philostratus' work Eusebius came to the conclusion that Apollonius could be acknowledged neither as a divine being (VII; VIII; IX) nor even as an honest man (V). His

miracles, as described by Philostratus, prove him to have been a mere *goēs* and a common wonder-worker (XXXI).

Eusebius' treatise is exceptionally boring and not convincing. Monotonous and tendentious as it is, nevertheless it accompanies almost all modern publications of VA. Thanks to Eusebius' attack the Church regarded Apollonius as an Antichrist and up to the nineteenth century it feared the demoralizing influence of VA on Christians¹⁴.

The disastrous influence of Philostratean "poison" had been already pronounced both in Hierocles' time and in the whole of the fourth century. Thanks to Hierocles, Philostratus, whose work had not been much read in the third century, became popular. The Greek magician and sage was remembered again, the centres of his cult flourished, talismans signed with his name began to circulate. Apollonius' statues and effigies reappeared. Hierocles appealed to the memory of the Greeks inhabiting the part of the Greek East where once Apollonius was well known and admired, and it was only his biography written by Philostratus that was not much popular there.

In the previous chapters several times we have referred to the legend of the Tyanean revived by Hierocles. We have discussed the role played by the cities connected with Apollonius, particularly by Antioch, in shaping its image. Here we would like to refer to Aegaeae again — Apollonius' "city of youth", for it seems that it was Aegaeae where soon after Hierocles' pronouncement an inscription — already known to us — was placed. It reminded the "world" of the Tyanean and extolled his services for human kind. We are certain that the timing of its publication was most apt.

In Diocletian's and Galerius' times, and later under Maximinus Daja, Hellenic beliefs found a fertile ground for their

¹⁴ Cf. Bowersock (in) Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius*, op. cit., pp. 20-21.

development. Pagan cults revived, dilapidated temples were restored, ancient sacrifices were reintroduced and the priesthood was renewed. It was probably then that the temple in Aegaeae flourished and the god Asclepios regained his previous significance¹⁵. Paganism managed to profit by this favourable situation only till 313 A.D.¹⁶. This year marked the abolition of all the restrictions once imposed on Christians, who could now retaliate for their previous oppression. Eusebius of Caesarea was lucky enough to live to see the day when pagan temples were destroyed. He described the destruction of Asclepios' temple in Aegaeae in 331 A.D. with a particular satisfaction¹⁷. He reports that Constantine the Great ordered the temple to be razed to the ground. Soldiers appointed to that task furiously knocked down statues of philosophers and a statue of the god Asclepios — "a deceiver of souls" (πλάνορ δέ τις ψυχῶν). Eusebius, who found much delight in this event, claimed that not a trace was left after the destruction of the old sanctuary.

Sozomenos also¹⁸ mentions the same event and the demolition of Aphrodite's temple in Aphaca in Syria. However, he grieves for this act. On the other hand, the historian Zonaras narrates the last efforts of pagans from Aegaeae directed to the renovation of the temple dedicated to their favourite god¹⁹. It happened in Julian the Apostate's time in 363 A.D. Zonaras writes that during his march against the Persians Julian stopped in Tarsus. Here he was visited by Artemius — Asclepios' priest. Artemius asked the emperor to allow pillars to be 'moved

¹⁵ ROBERT, *De Cilicie à Messine*, op. cit., p. 190 f.

¹⁶ Millar, op. cit., p. 576.

¹⁷ *De Vita Constantini* III 56; Edelstein, *Asclepius*, op. cit., II, p. 256; A. ALFÖLDI, *The Conversion of Constantine and pagan Rome*, Oxford 1948, p. 109.

¹⁸ *Historia Ecclesiastica* II 4-5.

¹⁹ *Epitome Historiarum* XIII 12 C-D.

from an old temple in Aegaeae back to their old place. They had been taken by a Christian bishop and used to erect a church in the city. The emperor immediately ordered the bishop of the Christian community to move the pillars at his own expense. Yet it was only one of the pillars that was eventually dragged to the threshold of the doorway of the church. Since it was impossible to drag it further, the undertaking was abandoned. After Julian's death the Christian bishop easily placed the pillar back in the church.

Zonaras' text is of a special significance for us, as it reports that the bishop Eusebius' joy over the complete destruction of Asclepios' sanctuary appeared to be premature. After all, some of its remnants managed to survive and served subsequently to build a Christian church. We may assume that the stone bearing the epigram on Apollonius of Tyana escaped destruction and survived till our times²⁰.

As we have already mentioned, all the students examining the Adana epigram assume that the block bearing the inscription constituted a part of an architrave or a lintel belonging to a certain sanctuary. It is likely that a statue of Apollonius was situated beneath the inscription on the lintel. Our assumption that the block with the epigram might have been situated near Asclepios' temple destroyed in 331 does not find much confirmation in the sources. However, we have not better ones. Eusebius writes about the destroyed statues of philosophers, Zonaras mentions pillars which escaped the destruction of the temple. It might have been that an effigy of Apollonius the sage was among those statues, as legend always connected him with Aegaeae; moreover, among the ruins of the temple might have been

²⁰ An inscription found in Epidaurus and dedicated to Asclepios of Aegaeae originated in 355 A.D. (Edelstein, *op. cit.*, II, p. 256). It mentions the destruction of Asclepios' temple in Aegaeae.

the block with the epigram which subsequently was transferred to Adana.

It is difficult to avoid a suspicion that the bishop of Caesarea was among the instigators of the step taken by Constantine the Great. The facts that Constantine ordered the destruction of Aphrodite's temples in Aphaca and in Baalbek might be explained by his desire to purify and to improve morally pagan practices²¹. But it is hardly possible to give the same reason for a barbarous devastation of Asclepios' temple who was a likable and good-natured divine-healer. It might have been caused by the fact that as a healer and saviour of mankind Asclepios was considered a rival to Christ by Christians. Yet still it remains unclear why it was that the temple in Aegaeae was demolished, and not for instance at Pergamum, Epidaurus or Cōs. In his *Life of Constantine* Eusebius also refers to this commonly held view and adds that Asclepios, a Cilician demon, usurped the name of a saviour which in fact belonged only to Christ. In our epigram Apollonius, like Asclepios himself, appears also as a saviour sent from heaven in order to save mankind. Was it not then that Eusebius' dislike of Apollonius, who was worshipped in Asclepios' temples as his priest, partly contributed to Constantine's harsh measure? After all, the bishop of Caesarea was a supporter of, and a close adviser to, the emperor in the times of the Nicaea Council and later²².

As we remember, the epigram bears the mark of Philostratus' biographical work. It suggests that this text was influenced by the work propagated by Hierocles. It follows that the inscription originated when the biography became commonly known, that is in Hierocles' time and

²¹ D. BOWDER, *The Age of Constantine and Julian*, London 1978, p. 80.

²² Cf. RAC Bd. 6, Lief 47, col. 1057 nn; BOWDER, *The Age of Constantine and Julian*, op. cit., pp. 71-76.

later in the fourth century. At that time it was popularized in Rome by Nicomachus Flavianus. As I have already shown in the previous chapter, in later centuries Philostratus' work was known only superficially, probably only from synopses and other than Philostratean sources. Our epigram is certain not to have originated in Rome. Apollonius, who like Asclepios hastened to help people in their troubles, sufferings and faults, and who was described by Philostratus as a giver of heaven (since he was an incarnation of Proteus) and a property of heaven (since he was received by heaven at the end of his life), must have been honoured in the East — most probably within the cult of Asclepios, in his temple in Aegaeae.

Taking into consideration those assumptions, we have fairly legitimate reasons to think that the epigram extolling Apollonius originated in the period between the publication of Hierocles work and 331 A.D., that is the year of the destruction of Asclepios' temple. Other dates seem to be less probable, including that of the second half of the fourth century²³, despite the fact that — theoretically speaking — the whole fourth century can be considered as the time of the origin of the inscription. After all, the second half of the fourth century still witnessed polemics between Christians and pagans over Apollonius. However, at that time Asclepios' temple in Aegaeae was already non-existent, and Cilicia Pedias was adorned with Christian sanctuaries (frequently built out of the remnants of pagan temples!). As we know, the temple in Aegaeae was not reconstructed even in the times of Julian the Apostate.

²³ Jones, *op. cit.*, pp. 193-94 and Dagron-Marcillet-Jaubert hold that the inscription originated between the publication of VA and Christianisation of the Empire (*op. cit.*, p. 405); J. and L. Robert date it back to Julia Domna's and Philostratus' time (*op. cit.*, p. 525). Jones, *loc. cit.*, adds that J. and L. Robert's variant cannot be excluded. However, Jones proves Christian accretions in the content of the epigram (*op. cit.*, p. 191 note 16).

Julian's reign was short-lived, whereas in Aegaeae there was a strong Christian community, as in Adana and in Taurus²⁴. By the second half of the fourth century both Tyana and Cappadocia had become fully Christianized²⁵. Pagans were in the minority being persecuted by either the state or local authorities. Antique statues and effigies were being destroyed. As we know from Pseudo-Justin, Apollonius' statue also shared its fate with those of other figures of the past. This was because Christians believed that Apollonius' statue was inhabited, like other antique statues, by a demon. It must have been then that all Apollonius' effigies were destroyed, and probably all his works and works about him. Thus it would be difficult to imagine that at the same time an inscription praising this rival of Christ, whose talismans were widely used by simple Christians at the end of the fourth century, was placed in a public, secular or cult, place. We remember that frequently some of the Fathers of the Byzantine Church vehemently condemned those talismans. A god who destroyed Apollonius' statue would not have allowed the placing of an epigram extolling the supernatural attributes of a sage and magician who was "sent by heaven".

Hierocles' challenge not only invigorated Apollonius' cult but also gave rise to polemics over the sage between pagan intellectuals and the Fathers of the Church — both Greek and Latin. The Fathers treated him as a magician and a rival of Christ, whereas pagans wrote about his *θεία καὶ ἀπρόητῳ σοφία* (C.H. II). As we remember, in the fourth and fifth centuries a friendly interest in Apollonius' magic was folk and gnostic in its character, and it was connected

²⁴ J. ZEILLER, *L'Empire romain et l'Église (Histoire du Monde V)*, Paris 1928, p. 133, 176 ff.

²⁵ P. ALLARD, *Julien l'Apostat*, Paris 1906, I, pp. 98-106. On pagan and Christian sanctuaries in the fourth century see Bowder, *op. cit.*, p. 129 ff.

with the places where Apollonius was remembered. Pagan intellectuals who succeeded Hierocles and who were interested in Apollonius regarded the magician from the Philostratean point of view. They praised him as a sage possessing almost divine attributes — here they followed Porphyry who was active before Hierocles. As we know, Porphyry, who knew Apollonius' philosophy, called him ἀνὴρ φιλοσοφία πάσῃ κεκοσμημένος²⁶, and in *De Abstinencia* he described him briefly as ἀνὴρ σοφός. Libanius, an outstanding Antiochian rhetor and a defender of classical ideals, juxtaposed Apollonius with Plato, Isocrates, Sophocles and Gorgias²⁷. Another famous rhetor of that time, Themistius, also remembered Apollonius. He held that three philosophers: Plato, Musonius Rufus and Apollonius of Tyana had distinguished themselves by their fight against tyranny²⁸. Eunapius of Sardis, whom we already know and who followed Hierocles in his deep antipathy to Christians, treated Philostratus' work as a story of "a visit of god to mankind" and claimed that Apollonius possessed his bodily frame only seemingly. Also in the *Theosophy of Tübingen*, a Christian forgery we have already mentioned, and which was based on pagan sources, Apollonius not only appeared in a company of seven sages, but also headed their list. It included: Apollonius of Tyana, Solon, Thucydides, Plutarch, Aristotle, Plato and Chilon. The same work mentions Apollonius along with Hermes Trismegistos and Moses as a man "standing close to God"²⁹.

In the fourth and at the beginning of the fifth centuries

²⁶ Cf. Chap. IV, p. 138.

²⁷ Or. 4, 4. In Or 16, 56 Libanius holds that Julian the Apostate's way of life resembled that of Apollonius of Tyana.

²⁸ Or. 6, 72 d.

²⁹ ERBSE, *Fragmente griechischer Theosophien*, op. cit., p. 216 and 177 (cf. Speyer, op. cit., p. 62 and note 105 and 106).

the Greek Fathers of the Church varied in their attitude toward Apollonius. After Eusebius' pronouncement and Lactantius' answer the fight against Philostratus' work declined. Probably this was due to the fact that Christianity was steadily gaining strength, whereas Apollonius' talismans and pseudoepigraphs which were popular in the Greek cities confirmed his fame which the Church had to reckon with. Ill-will towards Apollonius was particularly salient in the case of middle and late Byzantine authors who frequently wrote with indignation about the products of his demonic abilities.

At the end of the fourth century Isidorus of Pelusium admitted that Apollonius had been regarded by Christian writers as a magician because once he had been compared with Christ³⁰. Synesius of Cyrene, a neo-Platonic philosopher probably acquainted with Apollonius' Platonizing views, included him in his catalogue of bald sages. Yet for the sake of his bishop's conscience, he called him a *goēs*: μηθ' ἔι τις ἕτερος γόης καὶ περιττός τὰ δαιμόνια and he admitted that Apollonius had been long-haired³¹.

St. John Chrysostom adopted a stern attitude towards Apollonius, though even he could not resist a certain weakness for the Tyanean. In his homily devoted to St. Paul he called the philosopher a swindler and a *goēs* who had enjoyed but an evanescent popularity. In a polemic treatise against the Jews³² he provided an argument in support of the uniqueness of the work done by Christ and His Church, complaining at the same time that none of the Greek philosophers had deeply influenced the moral and religious life of the Greeks. Like his Antiochian teacher

³⁰ *Epistolae* I 398 (PG 78, 405 B); cf. Speyer, op. cit., p. 57.

³¹ *Calvitii laud.* 6 Terzaghi.

³² *Adv. Judeos* 5 (PG 48, 631 A).

Libanius³³, Chrysostom placed Apollonius among philosophers and put him on an equality with Zeno, Socrates and Diagoras. John Chrysostom did not deny that Apollonius once used to impress people, but at the same time he stressed that both his teachings and followers were quickly forgotten. That is why he regarded him only as a swindler. St. Cyril of Alexandria also had his word on Apollonius³⁴.

At the end of the fourth century the Latin Fathers of the Church showed some interest in Apollonius as well. This was due to the fact that by time Apollonius had become well-known also in the West. As we have pointed out several times, he was introduced there by pagan intellectuals of Rome.

The second half of the fourth century witnessed the formation of a pagan intellectual community headed by aristocratic Roman senators: first Vettius Agorius Praetextatus, and then Quintus Aurelius Symmachus and Virius Nicomachus Flavianus. On the basis of the available sources we may assume that the figure of Apollonius influenced belonging to that circle and their sympathizers. All of them were attached to the religion and political system of their predecessors, and in spite of the dissemination of Christianity they linked their religious life and political hopes to the Roman tradition of statesmanship, and treated priesthood as one of the stages of a public career³⁵.

Since the three outstanding leaders of the Roman intellectual community have been frequently dealt with in literature, I shall be sparing in discussing them. Praetextatus, who

³³ Cf. on Libanius: J.H.W.G. LIEBESCHUETZ, *Antioch, City and imperial Administration in the Later Roman Empire*, Oxford 1972, p. 242 ff.

³⁴ *Contra Julianum* 3 (PG 76, 633 D-636 A).

³⁵ P.R.L. BROWN, *Aspects of Christianisation of the Roman Aristocracy*, JRS 51, 1961, pp. 1-11.

in 367 was a prefect of Rome³⁶, became involved in the world of Greco-Oriental mysteries, and performed various functions as a priest in Rome. The latter resulted in his title of "princeps religiosorum"³⁷. He was of the opinion that each new cult he became engaged in enhanced his religious experience.

Symmachus, a prefect of Rome in 384³⁸, gave priority to Roman religion over Greco-Oriental cults. His contribution to the fight over the restoration of the altar of Victory to the meeting hall of the Roman Senate was famous throughout the Roman world³⁹, and his speeches on this subject shook public opinion. Particularly conspicuous was his credo of pagan faith: "Aequum est quidquid omnes colunt, unum putari. Eadem spectamus astra commune caelum est, idem nos mundum involvit, quod interest, qua quisque prudentia verum requirat? Uno itinere non potest perveniri ad tam grande secretum"⁴⁰. His polytheism was decidedly of a native character⁴¹.

The youngest Roman member of the opposition, Nicomachus Flavianus, an expert in augural knowledge, who was reputed to have been the embodiment of Roman virtues⁴², seems to have been a daring partisan of pagan cults. He was related to Symmachus, but surpassed him in his political ambitions, as well as considerably outranked his colleagues in his civil service career⁴³.

³⁶ PLRE, pp. 722-24.

³⁷ H. BLOCH, *The pagan Revival in the West at the End of the Fourth Century* (ed. A. Momigliano) Oxford 1963, pp. 202-04, 209-10, Macrobius in his *Saturnalia* I 11, 17 called him in that way.

³⁸ PLRE, p. 865-71.

³⁹ Cf. ST. WIECKOWSKI, *Z dziejów ostatniej reakcji pogańskiej w Rzymie starożytnym*, *Przegląd Klasyczny* III, 1973, p. 31-35.

⁴⁰ Symmachus, *Relatio* III 10 (MGH AA 6, 1, p. 282).

⁴¹ Cf. E. PASCHOD, *Réflexions sur L'Idéal religieux de Symmaque*, *Historia* 14, 1965, pp. 215-35.

⁴² PLRE, pp. 347-49.

⁴³ J.J. O'DONNELL, *The Career of Virius Nicomachus Flavianus*, *Phoenix* XXXII,

These pagan conservatives could aim at prominent posts and profess at the same time pagan religion, because they lived in Rome. After all, Rome occupied a unique position in the Empire, which by then had become almost Christian⁴⁴. Repressive measures taken against representatives of pagan religion which remained in force from the time of Constantius' reign were of little use there. Paraphrasing Gibbon's words⁴⁵, in this city, where the bishops claimed a right to Peter's office, the authority of the senate was so great that it not only successfully defended old cults but also influenced emperors and high officials in Italy.

The situation of the city was best depicted by Ammianus Marcellinus, who said that Rome would exist so long as humanity itself, and that the grey hair of its senators and the name of Roman citizens would always be held in proper respect⁴⁶. Even the Emperor Constantius II, ill-disposed to paganism, changed his attitude when he visited Rome in 357⁴⁷; he took part in pagan ceremonies, confirmed the prerogatives of the senate and named new priests. However, at the same time he ordered the removal of the altar of the goddess Victory from the Curia within which it had been housed for ages as a symbol of the permanence and power of Roman political institutions. This event led to a long standing fight between the senate and the emperors over the retrieval of the altar; the fight in which Symmachus particularly distinguished himself⁴⁸. Obviously, it died

1978, p. 136; W. HARTKE, *Geschichte und Politik in Spätantiken Rom, Untersuchungen über die Scriptores Historiae Augustae*; Klio 6, 1949, pp. 74-81; J.F. MATTHEWS, *The historical Setting of the Carmen Contra Paganos* (Cod. Par. Lat. 8084), *Historia* 19, 1970, pp. 464-79.

⁴⁴ G. BOISSIER, *La Fin du Paganisme*, Paris 1909, II, p. 234.

⁴⁵ *Zmierzch cesarstwa rzymskiego*, Warszawa 1960, II, p. 44.

⁴⁶ *Rerum Gest. libri XIV* 6.

⁴⁷ AL. KRAWCZUK, *Julian Apostata*, Warszawa 1970, pp. 58-66.

⁴⁸ Cf. L. MALUNOWICZ, *De Ara Victoriae*, Wilno 1937; J.J. SHERIDAN, *The Altar of Victory - Paganism's last Battle*, *L'Antiquité Classique* XXXV, 1960, pp. 186-206.

down during the short period or renaissance of pagan religion and culture spanned by the reign of Julian the Apostate when all the religious symbols and cults regained their previous significance. However, an attempt to create a religious system based on Neoplatonic philosophy proved abortive.

In 382 A.D. the Emperor Gratian once again removed the altar of Victory and together with Theodosius the Great launched a decisive attack on pagan religion. Both Emperors issued an edict which barred the offering up of sacrifices by day or night in temples and at the altars. Everybody who practised soothsaying could expect banishment. Apostasy from Christian faith was severely punishable, and thus particularly hit the aristocracy, frequently ambivalent in their faith. Finally in 391 Theodosius officially abolished pagan cults ⁴⁹.

Nicomachus Flavianus, as the then praefectus praetorio Italiae, was given this edict in 391; he learnt that all the pagan cults were done away with, and visiting temples was forbidden. In the years 393-94 Nicomachus was appointed praefectus praetorio iterum, and in 394 he was chosen a consul ⁵⁰. Already as a prefect of Italy, Nicomachus supported Flavius Eugenius, the emperor of the West, who was chosen by Arbogast (magister militum of Valentinian II). In the eyes of the Emperor Theodosius it was a flagrant usurpation as he appointed his son Honorius Augustus of the West. In 394 Theodosius launched a campaign against Eugenius. The consul Nicomachus Flavianus took part in that campaign on Eugenius' side. Christian writers claim that Eugenius' army bore the signs of pagan gods, and that Flavianus promised that after the victory he would turn

⁴⁹ BLOCH, *The pagan Revival in the West*, op. cit., p. 198.

⁵⁰ I quote after O'Donnel, op. cit., p. 136.

a basilica in Milan into a stable⁵¹. The Emperor Theodosius, who defeated Flavius Eugenius on the Phrigidus River, was seen as a defender of Christianity. In 394, soon after this battle, Nicomachus committed suicide.

Even if we agree with O'Donnel that in Eugenius' time a so called last pagan revival did not take place at all⁵², and that Eugenius' aims were purely political and not religious in their character, we cannot deny that Nicomachus Flavianus himself (together with his friends) followed conservative policy and that he supported the renewal of the religion and culture of his ancestors.

Senators in opposition not only tried to save the symbols of faith (like the altar of Victory) but also showed genuine reverence for the art and culture of the past. Suffice it to recall that as a prefect of Rome Praetextatus restored the Porticus Deorum Consentium in Forum Romanum, and its *sacrosancta simulacra*⁵³. Both he and senators related to him, as well as their families, put much effort into disseminating classical literature, among others Vergil's *Aeneid*, Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, Livy's work, Tacitus, Sallustius, and rhetorical works such as Cicero's speeches. The poet Macrobius, whose *Saturnalia* depict the atmosphere of his time and preserve the distinctive traits of these senators-humanists, was affiliated to this circle. Symmachus and his associates promoted publishing ac-

⁵¹ Cf. P. de Labriolle, *La Réaction païenne*, Paris 1948, pp. 351-52; Wieckowski, op. cit., pp. 69-78.

⁵² Op. cit., pp. 139-40; so far historians have assumed that there was a movement called "the last pagan revival" (cf. H. BLOCH, *A new Document of the Last Pagan Revival in the West*, Harvard Theological Review 38, 1945, pp. 199-241; D.M. ROBINSON, *An Analysis of the pagan Revival of the Late fourth Century with special Reference to Symmachus*, Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association 46, 1915, pp. 87-101). Obviously, the same view is held by other of the aforementioned authors (de Labriolle, Wieckowski).

⁵³ Cf. BLOCH, *The pagan Revival in the West*, op. cit., p. 195.

tivities. On the basis of Themistius' paraphrase, Praetextatus translated Aristotle's *Analytics* into Latin. Symmachus together with a son of Nicomachus Flavianus published the first decade of Livy's *History*, whereas Nicomachus Flavianus, apart from his compilations on philosophy and grammar, wrote a historical work *Annales*⁵⁴. First of all, however, he appears to have introduced to Roman literature the first translation of Philostratus' VA in Latin, which is of primary interest for us. Nicomachus' version was subsequently corrected by Tascius Victorianus who also belonged to Nicomachus' circle, whose members fostered various interests and where the knowledge of the Greek language was regarded as a commendable acquirement⁵⁵. In the fifth century Sidonius Apollinaris produced yet another translation of VA on the basis of Victorianus' version. It was he who described the publishing fortunes of VA in a letter addressed to his friend Leo, to whom he sent this work: "Apollonii Pythagorici vitam, non ut Nicomachus senior e Philostrati sed ut Tascius Victorianus e Nicomachi schedio excripsit, quia iusseras, misi; quam, dum parere festino, celeriter eiecit in tumultuarium exemplar turbida et praecepta et epica translatio"⁵⁶.

⁵⁴ Information on the activities undertaken by Roman senators in the field of culture I quote after Bloch, *op. cit.*, pp. 209-14.

⁵⁵ Cf. A. LOYEN, *Études sur Sidoine Apollinaire*, *Revue des Études Latines* XLVI 1968, pp. 85-86.

⁵⁶ *Epist.*, VIII 3, Loyen (in) Sidoine Apollinaire, *Lettres* III, Paris 1970, pp. 196-97 writes that the view, commonly quoted after Mommsen, that Nicomachus translated VA into Latin and that Victorianus published a new edition of VA also in Latin which later was utilized by Sidonius Apollinaris, cannot be sustained. According to Loyen, Nicomachus copied and published Philostratus' work in Greek. Also Victorianus published a Greek version of VA which subsequently was utilized by Sidonius. However, he wrote in a hurry, using bad "barbarous" Greek. The same problem was already discussed by Loyen (in) *Études sur Sidoine Apollinaire*, *op. cit.*, p. 85-86. Here, however, he accorded with Mommsen's view and argued with S. PRICOCO (*Sidonio Apollinare traduttore della Vita di Apollonio di Tiana di Filostrato*, *Nuovo Didaskaleion* XV, 1965, pp. 71-98).

It seems plausible that the passing pagan intelligentsia decided to follow Hierocles and to resort to the already symbolical figure of Apollonius in their fight against Christianity. In Rome Apollonius might have been already known thanks both to the famous polemic held between Hierocles and Eusebius, and also to the Greeks from the East who brought news of Apollonius' legend and of dissemination of his prophecies and talismans. They talked about Apollonius' popularity among the citizens of the Greek cities. One of them might have been the Antiochian Ammianus Marcellinus, the greatest historian in Rome at that time. However, apart from the Greeks, the aforementioned associates of Symmachus also travelled to the East. Many other senators from the West frequently visited that region and used to stay there for some time⁵⁷. Thus we are fully entitled to assume that the figure of Apollonius appealed to the imagination of those associated with Symmachus and Nicomachus. Roman members of the opposition, like the Greeks in Hierocles' time, needed somebody who could "compete" with Christ. Pagan intellectuals realized that in order to save the old, a religious and moral model of personality should be offered to passing pagan society. That is why Nicomachus Flavianus and Tascius Victorianus resolved to popularize the figure of a pagan thaumaturge

Pricoco held that (pp. 96-98) Nicomachus had published the Greek text of VA and the same had been done by Victorianus. It was only Sidonius who translated Philostratus into Latin and sent the text to his friend Leo who was sure not to have known Greek. A. CHASTAGNOL, *Recherches sur l'Histoire Auguste avec un Rapport sur les Progrès de la Historia Augusta - Forschung depuis 1963* (in) *Bonner Historia Augusta - Colloquium*, 1968, *Antiquitas*, Reihe 4 (Beitrag zur Historia Augusta Forschung, Bd. 6), Bonn 1970, p. 36 refers to former views that Nicomachus translated VA from Greek into Latin. Recently C.P. Jones left this question undecided (*An Epigram on Apollonius of Tyana*, op. cit., p. 194).

⁵⁷ This problem is discussed by M. Salamon in his innovatory and thorough work *Środowisko kultury łacinskiej w Konstantynopolu w IV wieku* (Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Śląskiego w Katowicach, nr. 206) Katowice 1971, pp. 87-101.

and a prophet of the old religion among Roman citizens who did not know the Greek language. It was not only the associates of Nicomachus Flavianus who would have liked to have a sort of holy book of paganism containing an exposition of polytheistic theology and Pythagorean ethic; above all, there were propagandist aims to be pursued with regard to the lower strata of pagan society. Only a "divine man" could help an average Roman to solve his religious problems and to prompt him to live up to the principles of Greco-Roman faith; the man who was sure of his ethical and religious path and who could set his own example as a model to be imitated.

Obviously, the fact that VA was translated or adapted is not in itself a sufficient argument corroborating our hypothesis that Nicomachus Flavianus and his associates aimed to import Apollonius to Rome. However, we have other arguments at our disposal. In the last decades of the fourth century the figure of Apollonius began frequently appearing in Latin sources. He also appeared on contorniose circular medallions which were popular in Rome proves that he was known also beyond the narrow circle of intellectuals. After all, the contorniates were treated as gifts which the Romans exchanged on the occasion of feasts and games; that is why the medallions frequently bore apotropaic and popular designs (verso), whereas their obverse depicted various figures connected with the history of Roman games, with culture and religion. Among the figures commemorated on the contorniates we can also find Apollonius. He is easily distinguishable because of his characteristic beard; he wears a toga, and a laurel wreath on his head⁵⁹.

⁵⁸ A. ALFÖLDI, E. ALFÖLDI, *Die Kontorniat-Medaillons*, Teil 1, Katalog (Antike Münzen und Geschnittene Steine VI, T.1) Berlin 1976, 15.41 32 Budapest 1943, pp. 74-76.

⁵⁹ Ibid., Tafel 38, 1-4.

A. Alföldi, who has studied the contorniates for a long time, came to the conclusion⁶⁰ that they were minted by outstanding Roman families of senators as an expression of antichristian propaganda in order to recall symbols and figures of the past. Alföldi traces the first emission of the contorniates back to the years 356-94, that is to the period which is of special interest for us. The second emission dates back to the beginning of the fifth century. However, other studies have denied Alföldi's assumptions. At present the contorniates are thought to have been only either gifts which marked particular feasts, or a sort of "tickets" for admission to the games⁶¹. A.N. Zadoks-Josephus Jitta, who studied the contorniates from an artistic point of view⁶², held that they were very cheap, artistically ineffectual and banal in their subject-matter — thus they must have appealed to the lower classes of Roman society. The authoress assumes that they might have also played the role of talismans, as sometimes they resembled various amulets used in Byzantium and Antioch which bore inscriptions of an apotropaic character.

Besides, the fact that an inscription containing the name of the philosopher — Apolonius Thyaneus — was found on a wall of one of the buildings in Rome may also suggest Apollonius' popularity there⁶³.

⁶⁰ Cf. A. ALFÖLDI, *Die Kontorniaten, Ein Verkanntes Propagandamittel der Städtrömische heidnischen Aristokratie in ihrem Kampfe gegen das christliche Kaisertum*, Festvortrag gehalten am 9 Mai 1941, Budapest 1943, pp. 8-18; 21 f., 48-84.

⁶¹ L. CRACCO-RUGGINI, *Sulla Cristianizzazione della Cultura pagana: il Mito greco e latino di Alessandro dell'Età Antoniniana al Medio Evo*, Athenaeum 1965, Nova Series 43, p. 12; S. MAZZARINO, *La propaganda senatoriale nel tardo Impero*, Doxa 4, 1951, p. 121 ff., J.M.C. Toynbee, a review of Alföldi's work (in) JRS 35, 1945 pp. 115-21; V.A. SIRAGO, *Galla Placidia e la Trasformazione politica dell'Occidente*, Louvain 1961, pp. 461 and 465.

⁶² *The Contorniates in the royal Cabinet at the Hague*, Mnemosyne 4, 1951, p. 82.

⁶³ ILS, 2918.

Reading literary works of the second half of the fourth century we find Apollonius first in the *Historia Augusta*. In the light of the latest studies this work is a monument of literature produced by aristocratic circles of pagans of late Rome⁶⁴. Its author must have been related to the associates of Symmachus and Nicomachus, the more so as he appeared genuinely interested in Apollonius. In his work he mentions Apollonius twice; first in the life of Alexander Severus where, under the name of Aelius Lampridius he writes that Alexander Severus' *lararium* had contained, between *optimos electos* and *animae sanctiores*, Apollonius' effigy together with those of Abraham, Orpheus and Christ⁶⁵. The coincidence of those names indicates that this information was invented at the end of the fourth century, although Aelius Lampridius holds that he derived it from a different source: "quantum scriptor suorum temporum dicit"⁶⁶. Johne, an outstanding student of HA, is very brief in his comment about this information: for him it is just an example of "die Ideologie der herrschenden Kreise in spätantiken Rom"⁶⁷.

⁶⁴ Latest studies on the authorship of HA are contained in P. JOHNE's *Keiserbiographie und Senatsaristokratie. Untersuchungen zur Datierung und sozialen Herkunft der Historia Augusta*, Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR, Zentralinstitut für alte Geschichte und Archaeologie Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur der Antike, Bd. 15, Berlin 1976, p. 71; 147; 151; 176. On the authorship of HA see also E. BIRLEY, *Fresh Thoughts on the Dating of the Historia Augusta* (in) *Bonner Historia Augusta-Colloquium 1975/76*, Antiquitas Reihe 4 (Beiträge zur Historia Augusta Forschung Bd., 13), Bonn 1978, p. 99; A.R. BIRLEY (*The Lacuna in the Historia Augusta*, *ibid.*, pp. 61-62); he claims that the author of HA was a loyal but not necessarily fanatic pagan. His attitude towards Christianity is full of ill-will and contempt.

⁶⁵ V. Alex., XXIX 2.

⁶⁶ On this statement cf. R. SYME, *Ammianus and the Historia Augusta*, Oxford 1968, p. 138; some authors, like E.R. DODDS, *Pagan and Christian in the Age of Anxiety*, *op. cit.*, p. 107, or Del Corno (in) *Filostrato, Vita di Apollonio di Tiana*, *op. cit.*, p. 30, think that this information is derived from the third century and concerns a genuine *lararium* which belonged to Al. Severus.

⁶⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 71.

In the life of Aurelian, written by one Flavius Vopiscus, Apollonius appears as a divine man and a famous philosopher, closely resembling his portrayal in Philostratus' work. The author of the life writes that there was not *inter homines* anybody "sanctius, venerabilius, antiquius, divinius-que" than Apollonius⁶⁸. Here he is said to have been commonly worshipped as an idol (numen)⁶⁹. Aurelian, laying siege to Tyana, saw a spectre which resembled the image of the thaumaturge's effigy which one could meet in numerous cities and temples⁷⁰. Besides, the author claims that Apollonius performed many supernatural deeds and that he even resurrected a dead man. So it is clear that the author knows Philostratus and that he utilizes his stories. Moreover, he asserts that he learnt about this from trustworthy men (graves viri) and read about it in books which he found in the Ulpia library. He adds that he would like to write a life of Apollonius himself in order to praise his merits. It is possible that he refers to Nicomachus Flavianus' translation of VA, since he mentions a certain "translator" Nicomachus⁷¹. However, there is also another possibility of interpretation here. R. Syme holds that the story concerning Apollonius, contained in the life of Aurelian together with a high appraisal of the magician might have been derived from Nicomachus Flavianus' *Annales*⁷². Jones follows Syme in his assumption that the author of the life not only read Nicomachus' *Annales*⁷³, but also that he was deeply moved by his sympathy for the sage of Tyana. E. Demougeot, studying political and religious predilections of Flavius Vopiscus, the alleged author of the life of

⁶⁸ V. *Aurel.*, XXIV 8.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, XXIV 3.

⁷⁰ XXIV 5.

⁷¹ XXVII 6.

⁷² *Ammianus and the Historia Augusta*, op. cit., p. 111.

⁷³ *An Epigram*, op. cit., p. 194.

Aurelian, came to the conclusion that Nicomachus Flavianus himself may be hidden under the name of Vopiscus⁷⁴. In the light of the latest studies on the author of HA, it is difficult to accord with Demougeot. However, these studies make at least one thing clear — the author of HA was connected with a pagan circle of Roman senators. That is why when he was writing the life of Aurelian he expressed their views, and his deep interest in the figure of Apollonius mirrored the interests of this group.

Ammianus Marcellinus' opinion on Apollonius resembles the one presented in HA; as we have already mentioned he learnt about Apollonius in his native Antioch and he probably utilized Nicomachus Flavianus' *Annales*⁷⁵. He writes that together with other famous figures of the past Apollonius enjoys the protection of *genii*⁷⁶, and he compares his wisdom to Plato's wisdom. The epithet he uses to describe both philosophers in *amplissimus*⁷⁷.

As we have mentioned, in his edition of the letters Penella suggests that certain of Apollonius' letters were added in the fourth century⁷⁸. It is possible that they were invented in the circle of Roman aristocrats. They were sure to have read other works connected with the name of Apollonius, and they knew Greek very well, so it would not be difficult for them to write short letters. However, it seems more probable that the letters were made up by a Greek who stayed in the East at that time. At any rate the invention concerned the letters whose subject-matter was derived

⁷⁴ *Flavius Vopiscus est-il Nicomache Flavien?*, *Antiquité Classique* 22, 1953, pp. 361-82.

⁷⁵ HARTKE, *Geschichte und Politik*, op. cit., p. 75 and ff. Stein, op. cit., p. 201 and 216.

⁷⁶ *Rerum Gest. libri XX* 14.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, XXII 6, 19 (*amplissimus ille philosophus Apollonius*); XIII 6, 32 (*auctor amplissimus Plato*).

⁷⁸ *The Letters*, op. cit., pp. 28-29.

from Philostratus' VA. It is possible that the letters about Apollonius' stay with the Brahmins (Epp. Apoll. 77 b and c) as well as some letters addressed to the Greek cities were invented in the fourth century. Both these aspects are thoroughly dealt with by Philostratus in VA. Also it seems that certain letters originated under the influence of Christian ascetic trends which condemned excessive bathing or public entertainments. In Epp. Apoll. 8 and 43 Apollonius expresses his contempt for bathing, whereas the Philostratan Apollonius bathes in cold water (VA I 16; II 22) and washes his feet (VIII 13). Epp. Apoll. 24, the letter disapproving of the Olympic games which otherwise are praised in VA (IV 24), has its roots in the same trend.

In order to confirm our hypothesis that it was pagan aristocrats who spread the myth of Apollonius in Rome we should also examine the opinion expressed by their opponents. Generally, it does not appear to have been so unfavourable as the one proclaimed by the Greek Fathers at the beginning of the fourth century. After all, the Latin Fathers who wrote about Apollonius already knew that the ultimate victory belonged to them. They did not consider Apollonius a threat, in spite of the fact that Nicomachus Flavianus and his associates tried to popularize him in Rome. At the time when Nicomachus translated VA, St. Jerome briefly recapitulated Philostratus' work in one of his letters⁷⁹. Jerome read Philostratus' VA probably because of the measures taken by the circle of Symmachus and Nicomachus. He stayed in Rome between 382-85 as a secretary to the Pope⁸⁰. However, he spent the better part of his life in the East and finally he settled in Bethlehem

⁷⁹ *Epistulae* 53, Hilberg.

⁸⁰ Cf. A. CHASTAGNOL, *La Supplique inventé par Avidius Cassius; Remarques sur l'Histoire Auguste et la Lettre 1 de Saint Jérôme*, *Bonner Historia Augusta-Colloquium* 1970, *Antiquitas*, Reihe 4, (Beiträge zur Historia Augusta Forschung, Bd. 10) Bonn 1972, pp. 96-97.

where he undertook philosophical studies. We many assume that he knew Apollonius' legend which was spread in Syria. In his letter, Jerome espoused a high opinion of Apollonius. While recapitulating Philostratus, he also described the travels of the sage of Tyana and emphasized their moral aspect. He writes that they bettered him since each new place he visited and each man he met added to his knowledge: "invenit ille vir ubique quod disceret: et semper proficiens, semper se melior fieret". Jerome tells the truth when he writes that people called Apollonius a magician, whereas Pythagoreans regarded him as a philosopher: "sive ille magus ut vulgus loquitur, sive philosophus ut Pythagorici tradunt".

As we remember, elsewhere Jerome quotes Porphyry's words concerning miracles worked by the Tyanean. However, his comment about Porphyry's enchantment by Apollonius' thaumaturgic powers which Porphyry felt were worthy of Christ, expresses contempt: "Fecerunt et alii signa magicis artibus, sed pro homine mortuo non sunt mortui, pro homine crucifixo non sunt crucifixi. Sciunt iste hominem esse mortuum et moriuntur sine causa? Felix ergo nostra victoria, quae in sanguine apostolorum dedicata est. Fides nostra non probatur nisi per illorum sanguinem"⁸¹.

Jerome returns to the same subject matter in his other work. Here again he is full of contempt for those who scorned miracles performed by Christ and accepted instead miracles worked by pagan gods and magicians⁸². In order to illustrate common beliefs in miracles produced by various magicians, Jerome recalls a popular and apparently reliable story about Apollonius' disappearance from Domitian's court. Obviously, his comment is highly ironic⁸³.

⁸¹ Cf. Chap. III, p. 98.

⁸² *Contra Johannem Hierosol. ad Pammachium* 43 (PL 23, 404 C).

⁸³ *Ibid.*, Apollonius Tyaneus scribitur cum ante Domitianum staret in consistorio, repente non comparuisse.

The letters written by St. Augustine tell us that at the end of the fourth century not only Apollonius' miracles but also those performed by Apuleius were commonly talked about. As we remember, Porphyry had already linked both those figures. Lactantius did the same at the beginning of the fourth century. Like Augustine, he was an African and knew legends about Apuleius who was also born in Africa. Lactantius severely criticized those who "ignobly" dared to draw bold comparisons between Apollonius, Apuleius and Christ⁸⁴. In his letter to Marcellus, Augustine complains that pagans would have believed the miracles described in the Bible had they been performed by Apollonius or Apuleius: "et tamen si hoc quod de Jona scriptum est, Apuleius Madaurensis, vel Apollonius Tyaneus fecisse diceretur... si de istis, ut dixi, quos magos vel philosophos laudabiliter nominant, tale aliquid narraretur, non iam in buccis creparet, sed typhus"⁸⁵. Following Eusebius, Augustine ridicules those who compared Christ with those two "experts at magic": quis autem vel risu dignum non putet, quod Apollonium et Apuleium, caeterosque magicarum artium peritissimos conferre Christo"⁸⁶. However, finally he admits that also Christians should realize that Apollonius was superior to old pagan gods, and even to Jove himself, in respect of virtue: "multo enim melior, quod fatendum est, Apollonius fuit, quam tot stuprorum auctor et perpetrator, quem Jovem nominant".

In an anonymous work linked to the name of St. Ambrose, who was the greatest enemy of Roman paganism⁸⁷ we can find unfavourable opinions on Apollonius as com-

⁸⁴ *Div. Inst.*, V 3 Brandt.

⁸⁵ *Epistulae* 102, Goldbacher.

⁸⁶ *Ep.* 138, 18 Goldbacher.

⁸⁷ Cf. Wieckowski, *op. cit.*, p. 29 ff.

pared to Christ by pagans⁸⁸. The work also repeats the view that Apollonius was a magician.

Thanks to Nicomachus, Philostratus' biographical work enjoyed popularity still in the fifth century. At that time its new translation was sent by Sidonius Apollinaris to his friend, a high official at the court of the Visigoths in Toulouse.

Apollinaris translated VA on the basis of Tascius Victorianus. In his letter to Leo he described Apollonius in the following way: "Divest yourself somehow of your never-ending cares and steal respite of your own from the burdens and commotions of the court. You will not study advantageously and adequately the tale you have requisitioned unless you give undivided attention to the reading of it and, so to speak, travel in person along with our man of Tyana, now the Caucasus or the Indus, now to the gymnosophists of Aethiopia and the Brahmins of India. Read of a man who — be it said with all due deference to the Catholic faith — was in most respects like you, that is, sought after by the rich but not seeking riches for himself; greedy for knowledge but chary of money-making; abstemious in feasts, clad in plain linen amid the purple-robed, severe as a censor amid luxurious perfumes; unkempt, hairy, and bristly in the midst of scented foreigners, and treasured for dignified squalor among the myrrh-scented, pumice-rubbed, cinnamon-soaked satraps of tiara'd kings; more respected than suspected in the Eastern kingdoms he traversed because he derived no article of food or clothing from an animal; and asking from the royal resources which were placed fully at his disposal only such

⁸⁸ Ps. AMBROSIIUS, *De Trinitate* 29 (PL 17) 2nd ed. (570 B). This text written by Pseudo-Ambrose is in fact a treatise directed against Priscillianus written by an anonymous author from the fourth or fifth century (*Clavis Patrum Latinorum* No 171), who quotes Jerome here, *Contra Johannem Hierosol.* 34).

boons as he was accustomed to accept for bestowal on others, not for retention by himself. I need say no more. If we weigh and reckon the truth of the matter, it comes to this: it may be questioned whether the philosopher's life has found a narrator on a level with the writers of our ancestors' time; but unquestionably this generation of mine has found in you a reader to match the subjects"⁸⁹.

In the last decades of the fourth century, and especially at its end, the myth of Apollonius was spreading in Rome as is proved by both written and material sources. It was propagated purposefully, out of political and, above all, religious reasons. Such an outstanding politician as Nicomachus Flavianus would not have put so much effort into his translation of VA if he had not aimed at popularizing the views of the Tyanean among the less educated classes of Roman society who did not know Greek. Also the contorniates bearing Apollonius' effigy prove that somebody wanted to make his likeness well known. Yet it is difficult to assess how strongly the myth of Apollonius influenced the masses. I do not think it is an exaggeration to write that both Pythagoreanism and Apollonius' attachment to pagan cults elicited admiration from the leaders of the opposition to Christianity. However, an unhappy fate awaited the pagan philosopher so praised by Nicomachus and Sidonius Apollinaris. Apart from VA, pieces of information on Apollonius which have managed to survive till our time are less than scarce. Biographical works written by Maximus, Moiragenes, Soterichos and maybe by other authors are lost. Probably they still existed in the fourth century, since we read in HA that the author of the life of Aurelian utilized numerous works about Apollonius written in the Greek language. So at that time books about Apollonius were circulating, his statues, temples, talismans and

⁸⁹ Ep. VIII 3.

pseudoepigraphs were known, from among which only few have reached our time. As we learn from Settis's paper ⁹⁰, apart from the contorniates and one bust of a dubious origin, none of Apollonius' effigies have been discovered so far. What has managed to survive is an inscription from Apollonius' sanctuary, now housed in the Adana museum. The idea arises that the lack of literary works on Apollonius and of his effigies is due to the fight carried on by Christianity against paganism. After all, Apollonius represented a threat to the Church in spite of a frequently ambivalent attitude towards the sage adopted by Christians. Numerous Christian authors either criticized him or rendered him shallow. The biographical work of Philostratus is the only one which managed to survive the fight and to find such defenders among Christians as Sidonius Apollinaris.

The impact exerted by Apollonius in antiquity must have been really powerfully since he managed to survive in a hostile Christian world till the Middle Ages. This is confirmed by information contained in Byzantine and Arabic sources, as well as by his likeness on a fresco from 1560 A.D. in St. Nicholas church on the Joannina Island in Epirus. Here, as in old good days, the philosopher is depicted together with seven sages. Again he is accompanied by Plato, Solon, Aristotle, Plutarch, Thucydides, and Chilon. The fact that he is turbaned proves his links with the wisdom of the East. All the sages, apart from Thucydides, are called "Έλληνες, whereas only Thucydides is called "ο φιλόσοφος.

So even in the sixteenth century Apollonius was remembered as one of those Hellenists who had outlived the fall of paganism. Although the victorious Christian

⁹⁰ Severo Alessandro, *op. cit.*, pp. 237-51.

⁹¹ De Settis, *op. cit.*, p. 245; Speyer (*op. cit.*, p. 63) pays attention to a medieval Greek source which contains a prayer to "Saint Balinas".

culture condemned the Tyanean, by rejecting the legend it accepted the values which underlay the thought and activities of the Philostratean "divine man".

CONCLUSIONS

We have already shown in the Introduction that the majority of scholarly works on Apollonius of Tyana usually present his life and views in conformity with Philostratus' biographical work. However, first Meyer, and then Bowie and Penella revealed in their studies on the sources and on the literary form of VA the extent of fabrication, fiction, and historical falsity contained in this book. Now we know that in order to unveil the historical Apollonius we have to go back to fragmentary documents of the pre-Philostratean tradition and, as we have tried to prove in the present work, to accounts which pertain to later post-Philostratean, Byzantine, and even Arabic tradition. Having taken advantage of such ample materials, we managed to obtain some historically reliable pieces of information on Apollonius.

First we determined that Apollonius had lived probably from about 40 A.D. till about 120 A.D., and not, as Philostratus claims, from 4 or 3 B.C. till 97 A.D. We are certain that we have one genuine story from the life of the historical Apollonius. Thanks to Cassius Dio's account parallel to Philostratus, we know that in Domitian's time Apollonius stayed in Ephesus where he expressed his hatred for this emperor. This happened when he witnessed the emperor's death by means of his telepathic powers. We cannot say much about Apollonius' position in the Roman world. Apollonius' relationships with philosophers and sophists of the first century, so extensively dealt with by Philostratus, do not find confirmation in historical sources. The only person Apollonius could have really known was the Stoic philosopher Euphrates, Apollonius' opponent, who

criticized his magic and philosophical views. Apollonius might have met him in northern Syria, maybe in Antioch itself.

The Ephesian story the sage of Tyana prompted us to search for other cities where the historical Apollonius had made his stay. In the light of a detailed analysis of the sources from various times, it appears that Apollonius was worshipped and remembered in several cities of Asia Minor (Ephesus, Aegaeae, his native Tyana) and also in northern Syria (Antioch). Apollonius' sanctuaries were situated in those cities and stories about his prophecies, thaumaturgies, Asclepeian healing and later on his talismans were remembered there. What was also remembered was his moral admonitions.

The tradition of the sage and magician was always observed by certain Greek cities and Greek authors up till late Byzantine times. "Geography" of the sources containing information on Apollonius confirms this fact. With few exceptions, he was remembered till the late Middle Ages only in the Greek East.

Thus, despite Philostratus' descriptions and assertions which linked Apollonius with Rome, he had never visited the capital of the Empire, neither had he ever reached Spain. Likewise, he never went to Persia, India, Egypt, or Ethiopia, although the latter might have appeared more plausible for the reader who knew where Apollonius had lived and where he had been active. In his lifetime Apollonius was held in great esteem in Aegaeae (where he made himself memorable for his healing activities in Asclepios' sanctuary), in Tyana and in Ephesus. However, the place where Apollonius' legend persisted for the longest period of time was Antioch, from where his talismans were brought to Byzantium, and from where pseudoepigraphs signed with his name were spread. The Arabs, who regarded Apollonius

as a master of alchemy, philosophy and cosmogony, learnt about him from Syria.

Being known only in a few cities of the Greek East, Apollonius was imperceptible in the perspective of the whole Empire; none of his contemporary writers mentioned him. Besides, nobody seemed to have paid much attention to his original and interesting philosophy, so distorted by Philostratus in VA, because probably he was regarded as a mere magician. However, by a happy coincidence, a fragment of a philosophical work written by Apollonius and entitled *περὶ θυσιῶν* was preserved by Porphyry and Eusebius. In this work, Apollonius argues that god who remains outside the world of senses does not need anything of earthly things, neither does he need earthly adoration. Moreover, he does not expect any material offerings from man. Instead, man is urged to worship god only through his intellectual powers which allow him to discern true values and to demonstrate his moral virtues. Thanks to the preserved fragment of Apollonius' work we can place him in the eclectic philosophical thought of the first and second centuries, and introduce him among Platonizing Pythagoreans of the early Empire.

In his lifetime Apollonius did not enjoy much fame which would be worth noticing; it was only his legend that gave him lustre and significance. His legend developed thanks to a governor of Bithynia — Sossianus Hierocles, who used Philostratus' work, none too popular in the third century, to combat Christianity. By opposing Apollonius to Christ, Hierocles gave rise to polemics over the magician of Tyana held between the Fathers of the Church and enlightened pagans, defenders of Hellenism. At that time the name of Apollonius found its place in the writings of the Fathers of the Church, whereas pagans commemorated him with verbal tribute and admiration, and with an inscription which at present is housed in the Adana Museum.

It is highly probable that this polemic facilitated the dissemination of Apollonius' legend in Rome in the second half of the fourth century, where a leading representative of Roman senators Nicomachus Flavianus either translated VA into Latin or adapted it, and numerous Latin authors began discussing the figure of Apollonius. We have devoted to the development of Apollonius' legend in the fourth century a separate chapter, as it originated then still under the influence of authentic sources containing information on our hero. Those authentic sources were lost during the decline of the pagan Empire, sharing their fate with books about Apollonius, with his statues and his writings. What has managed to survive was a few of his effigies, some pieces of information on him, and on his talismans transmitted by various authors, and Philostratus' biographical work which found well-disposed defenders in such Christians as for instance Sidonius Apollinaris. Full of admiration for the sage of Tyana, he made yet another translation of VA into Latin in the fifth century.

As we remember, in the Severi's times Apollonius was known only in a narrow circle of people attached to the emperor's court, where he was introduced thanks to Empress Julia Domna. In VA (I 3) Philostratus claims that she was the person who prompted him to write VA. In this case we are certain that Philostratus follows the truth. Julia Domna was the only person in Rome who might have made Philostratus pay attention to the figure of Apollonius. Like Apollonius himself, she derived her origin from the eastern confines of the Empire. She was born and lived, until her marriage with Septimius Severus, in Syrian Emesa, that is in the region where the figure of Apollonius was known and generated interest. It is highly possible that information on Apollonius spread to Emesa which was the centre of cultural and religious life of central Syria. It might have been transmitted from Antioch which, as we have

proved in chapter III, for many centuries played an important role in passing down Apollonius' tradition. Also Tyana and Aegaeae might have had their role in disseminating stories about Apollonius which eventually reached Emesa. After all, the regions where the cities remembering Apollonius were situated constituted a cultural unity; besides, they were criss-crossed by roads and sea-routes (Aegaeae) which connected Asia minor with Syria¹. It was there that both Lucian and Cassius Dio heard about Apollonius; Dio, like Philostratus himself, belonged to the intellectual circle of Julia Domna. Those authors, however, and particularly Lucian, did not hold a high opinion on Apollonius. Contrary to Lucian, who despised Apollonius because of his magic and philosophising mysticism, Julia Domna was not inimical to philosophy and religion. After all, she descended from a family of a priest of Baal where religious matters were of cardinal importance. We also know her philosophical predilections. Cassius Dio mentions her philosophical interests twice², whereas Philostratus calls her ἡ φιλόσοφος Ιουλία³. We are certain that Julia Domna was interested in Apollonius not only because he had been a seer and a thaumaturge. At that time there were many magicians and charlatans moving about in Syria and Asia Minor. Greek and Roman authors did not pay special attention to them; only few mentioned them in their writings. Apollonius kindled the interest of Julia Domna probably because he had been a sage, an original philosopher engaged in religion and in theological speculations, and because his magic had been of a beneficial, and not of a deceptive character. A daughter of a priest of Baal must have found this kind of philosophical thought appealing. Probably she

¹ Cf. ROBERT, *De Cilicie à Messine*, op. cit., p. 192.

² LXXVIII 18, 3; LXXVI 15, 4.

³ VS II 30 (p. 300 Wright).

preferred Apollonius' philosophy to Euphrates' Stoicism. It is also possible that she advocated this philosophy as it belonged to Platonizing neo-Pythagoreanism which was just gaining momentum in Syria in the second century. After all, a leading representative of neo-Pythagoreanism, Numenius, was a native of Apameia which adjoined Emesa, whereas Nicomachus was connected with Gerasa in Transjordan. Julia Domna must have found Apollonius' activities as an Asclepeian doctor appealing as well, because both she and the whole family of the Severi that she joined by marriage belonged to the followers of this god⁴.

In order to help Philostratus in writing a biography of the sage of Tyana, Julia Domna "presented" him with a notebook of Damis who allegedly had obtained it from Apollonius' relative (I 3). Evidently, it is a literary fiction but concocted, as it seems, with a full awareness. Julia Domna knew that not much information on Apollonius had managed to survive, and that nobody so far had produced a comprehensive work on Apollonius' life from his birth to his death. Maximus described only Apollonius' stay in Aegaeae and in Cilicia; Moiragenes discussed his magic and philosophy. Certain letters of Apollonius, mostly apocryphal, circulated in Syria where also his *περὶ θυσιῶν* might have been read. In spite of that, Philostratus did not have at his disposal a reliable source written by somebody who had maintained a close relationship with Apollonius and who was a native of the regions visited by the sage. Only such a source might have authenticated the biography he aimed to write. Thus together with Julia Domna, as it appears, he created Damnis the Syrian from Niniveh⁵ to whom, as to a most faithful pupil of Apollonius, he attributed the authorship of the history of

⁴ Cf. Robert, *op. cit.*, pp. 184-99.

⁵ On Damis' origin cf. Meyer, *op. cit.*, p. 376.

Apollonius' life that he made up himself. Julia Domna did not have any doubts that the Greek reader, who heard anything about Apollonius, would believe in the authenticity of the biography based on a notebook written by the author who came from the same region as the historical Apollonius. Philostratus, who found it also convincing, accompanied Julia Domna in her travels during which she probably showed him the cities connected with Apollonius. After all, in VA he mentions that he utilized accounts on Apollonius preserved in various cities, and in VS he reports his stay in Antioch⁶.

Bowie's suggestion that Philostratus coined the name of the author of his fictitious source taking as a model the name of a well-known sophist Flavius Damianus of Ephesus seems to be possible. On the other hand, it is difficult to determine if Speyer is right in assuming that certain Pythagoreans paid a visit to Julia Domna and gave her a memoir written by a supposed pupil of Apollonius.

Julia Domna might have met certain admirers of the Tyanean, yet they were probably those who admired his beneficial magic or those who shared his views, expressed in *περὶ θυσίων*, on god and on the way he should be worshipped. It is difficult to ascertain whether they were Pythagorean philosophers or simply the inhabitants of the cities which remembered Apollonius. However, one thing is clear: Philostratus' Pythagoreanism as presented in VA is very superficial and does not square with the Pythagorean speculations of his time. Had Julia Domna really wanted Philostratus to expose Apollonius' genuine views which most probably she adhered to herself, she would not have let him produce such a superficial and banal picture of the philosopher's thought. However, Philostratus was more in-

⁶ Cf. Chap. II, p. 74, see also Birley, *Septimius Severus*, op. cit., p. 241.

terested in turning his work into an exemplary rhetorical composition. In that way he meant to appeal to the Syrian Empress who was an ardent lover of rhetorical exercises.

We do not know if Julia Domna was satisfied with Philostratus' work, as it appeared after her death. Yet she must have been pleased that a man of letters who belonged to her circle took the trouble to describe the life of a magician and philosopher who gained popularity in Asia Minor and Syria, and that thanks to her he introduced the figure who was little known but was worth commemorating to Greek literature.

APPENDIX

MODERN POLEMICS OVER APOLLONIUS OF TYANA

“Avant l'heureuse révolution qui a changé en France l'opinion publique sur presque toutes les matières, il n'eût été ni prudent, ni sûr, de s'exprimer sur Apollonius. Il falloit, sous peine d'être poursuivi par l'inquisition religieuse, parler de lui, comme eu ont parlé les anciens auteurs ecclésiastiques et les modernes”.

(Pierre-Jean-Bapt. Legrand d'Aussy, *Vie d'Apollonius de Tyane*, Paris 1807, p. XXXIV)

The legend of Apollonius, whose ancient fortunes we already know well, revived again in the Renaissance thanks to a mounting interest in magic, in classical literature and in the writings of the Fathers of the Church. Renaissance Europe adopted the image of Apollonius as shaped during the polemics held between Christian and pagan writers. To a greater extent than in Rome and in Byzantium, the modern legend of Apollonius was influenced by the antichristian publication of Sossianus Hierocles who demonstrated the superiority of Apollonius' thaumaturgy over Christ's miracles. As we shall see below, it was Hierocles who formed the European point of view on Apollonius. With few exceptions, European writers used to treat Apollonius as an enemy of the Church, as a skilful magician and a false wonder-worker till the times of the Enlightenment.

Aldus Manutius, an eminent typographer of the Renaissance, was chiefly responsible for the restoration of

the legend of Apollonius¹. This Venetian publisher of classical literature also did not overlook Philostratus' biographical work. However, the publishing of the *Life of Apollonius* encountered many problems.

Towards the end of the 15th century the Vatican launched a direct and uncompromising attack against occult arts, at the same time persecuting humanists suspected of practising those arts². Aldus Manutius must have realized the risk he ran in publishing the work which had been condemned as devoted to magic already by the Fathers of the Church. The sources tell us that the actual publishing was preceded by long preparatory steps and debates held by intellectuals associated with Aldus. It is possible that the discussion about the way Philostratus' work should be published was carried on already in the years 1482-84 when Aldus stayed in Mirandola as a guest of Francesco Pico, an expert in classical literature and philosophy³. There the decision to publish the biography along with an apologetic treatise written by Eusebius of Caesarea against Apollonius might have been reached. Such a form of publishing must have been regarded as the best way to allay the suspicions of the Church. In Pico's work we find interesting remarks about the *Life of Apollonius* and about Eusebius' treatise which confirm his and Aldus' interest in "the magician of Tyana".

As seen through his writings, Pico's attitude towards Apollonius was hostile. In the tenth chapter of his treatise *De Rerum Praenotione*⁴ Pico delivers a fierce attack

¹ Cf. M. ROKOSZ, *Wenecka oficyna Alda Manucjusza i Polska w orbicie jej wpływów*, Wrocław 1982, p. 33 ff.

² R. BUGAJ, *Nauki tajemne w Polsce w dobie Odrodzenia*, Wrocław 1976, pp. 41-44.

³ A. RENOUARD, *Annali delle Edizioni Aldine*, Bologna 1953, p. 376.

⁴ Joannis Francisci Pici Mirandulae *Opera Omnia*, Basilea 1519, pp. 664-674;

against Apollonius' magical practices. He accuses Apollonius of taking advantage of demonic magic in order to imitate Christ's deeds and miracles, and charges him with collaborating with impure powers. Simultaneously he admires Eusebius of Caesarea's work freshly translated into Latin by a Dominican Zenobio Acciolo.

Today we find it difficult to assess to what extent Pico's arguments mirrored his real views. After all, the humanist of Mirandola remained under the surveillance of the Inquisition and was condemned because of his studies of magic in 1487. The atmosphere of suspicion and threat created by the Church must have also been felt by Aldus, and it must have influenced his official statements.

The editio princeps of the *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, which finally appeared in the years 1501-2-4, consisted of three parts: the Greek text of the *Life* (1501), the treatise written by Eusebius of Caesarea against Hierocles in its Latin version by Zenobio Acciolo (1502), and the Latin text of Philostratus' biographical work translated by Alemanno Rinuccino (1504)⁵.

In the introduction to the Latin version of the work addressed to Zenobio Acciolo, Aldus gave vent to his aversion both to the work and to its author: "Sperabam in libris Philostrati, me quam plurima atque digna scitu atque praeclara lectorum; sed longe aliter certe evenit. Nihili enim unquam memini me legere *deterius* lectuque *minus dignum*. Nam non modo fabulosa omnia atque anicularum narrationibus persimilia visa sunt, sed insulsa quoque atque perinepta...". Furthermore, the publisher admits that his

similar opinions are held by Pico in his work *De Fide atque Ordine credendi Theoremata*, op. cit., pp. 234-236.

⁵ *Philostrati de Vita Apollonii libri octo*. Idem libri latini interprete Alemanno Rinuccino florentino. Eusebius contra Hieroclem atque Tyaneum Christo conferre conatus fuerit. Idem latinus interprete Zenobio Acciolo florentino ordinis praedicatorum. In folio. Venetii apud Aldum, Mense Martio MDI.

doubts whether the work would gain any popularity arose not only because of the poor quality of its author's literary craft⁶. Above all, he finds repellent the ideas alien to the principles of Christian religion which are expressed in the work, and the descriptions of Apollonius' magical practices deceptively similar to Christ's miraculous deeds. Aldus attacked Philostratus' work and published it along with Eusebius of Caesarea's treatise in order to, as he wrote, to prevent the "pagan poison" from spreading without being accompanied by the antidote: "ut si quispiam ex Philostrati libris veneni aliquid bibisset haberet Eusebium: quo ut mustella ad rutam a serpente demersa confugeret...".

In his introduction to Eusebius of Caesarea's treatise Acciolo explains his undertaking in similar terms. On the one hand, he writes about ideological pitfalls awaiting the reader of the *Life of Apollonius*, whereas on the other hand he praises the apologetic force of Eusebius' treatise. He warns young people, always susceptible to various charms of irrationalism, against the pernicious impact of Philostratus' work. It is to them that he dedicates the treatise written by the Father of the Church, and he advises them that they should treat it as a comprehensive commentary to the *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*. Acciolo is particularly happy that he could contribute to combating the work which propagated magic and threatened the ideals and interests of Christianity. He glorifies Eusebius for his perseverance in the fight against superstitions advocated by Philostratus. Acciolo claims that as judged against the moral force of Eusebius' treatise the work by the sophist of Lemnos loses the value once ascribed to it by Hierocles, whereas the comparison between Apollonius and Christ drawn by Hierocles, which led to a confusion of notions, is unconvincing and

⁶ Renouard, op. cit., p. 18 explains that different dates of particular parts of the work are due to the publisher's doubts as to the value of this work.

flimsy. However, Acciolo's arguments do not change the fact that he contributed to the publishing of the book from which the majority of readers were certain to have drunk the pagan poison prepared by Philostratus.

The Aldus edition exercised a great influence on later publications of the *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*. Thanks to Aldus, till this day Philostratus' work has been published together with Eusebius of Caesarea's treatise.

The editio princeps published by Aldus was soon followed by new publications of Philostratus' biographical work in various countries and in various cultural spheres; the 15th century witnessed an avalanche of treatises, contributions, and literary works devoted to the prophet of Tyana. The figure of Apollonius occupies much space in Church historiography and in monographs devoted to the history of the early Roman Empire.

Taking into consideration intentions of the authors we can distinguish two trends prevailing in the aforementioned literary output. The first of them, which correspondingly we shall call instrumental, dominates in the works of the 17th century and of the first half of the 18th century. Here the authors of both Christian and antichristian inclinations regard Apollonius as a vehicle for achieving their own ends. Thus they treat him as shapeless dummy which they animate by attributing to him such views as their ideological needs might be; such an Apollonius has little to do with the real hero of Philostratus' work. For the Church authors he is a repugnant demon, whereas the enemies of the Church consider him a mere embodiment of their own ideas. We shall put a special emphasis on the instrumental trend because its representative initiated modern polemics over Apollonius of Tyana.

The second, non-instrumental trend comprises a few works written in the 17th and 18th centuries; above all, however, it concerns scientific publications produced in the 19th cen-

tury which we have utilized in our studies of Apollonius. Their authors disregard religious contentions over Apollonius and aim at objectivity in their studies of Philostratus' biographical work, laying stress on the analysis of the historical and ideological origin of the work.

Vernacular publications of Philostratus' work gave an impetus to the development of the Apollonius issue; Latin and Greek translations of Philostratus' text published in the 16th century repeat the editio princeps by Aldus Manutius⁷.

Already in 1549 VA was translated into Latin⁸; in 1596 B. Vigenère published his translation in French⁹, subsequently corrected by F. Moreal in 1611. In 1680 Ch. Blount printed VA in English along with the commentaries by Lord Herbert of Cherbury¹⁰. Despite the fact that those works were superseded by an excellent publication of VA edited by G. Olearius in 1709, they remain the genuine relics of a pro-Church branch of the instrumental trend in the literature on Apollonius of Tyana¹¹.

Representatives of this trend regard themselves as the spiritual followers of Eusebius of Caesarea and of those Fathers of the Church who treated the problem of Apollonius as a theological one. They resume the old debate and enrich it with their own fantastic speculations. Theories they advance imply a pernicious influences of Apollonius' teachings on the first Christians, and his sinister and sly

⁷ Cf. for instance *Philostrati Lemnii senioris Historiae de vita Apollonii libri VIII*. Alemano Rhinuccino Florentino interprete. Eusebii Caesariensis adversus Hieroclem, qui ex Philostrati historia Apollonium Christo aequiparare contendebat, Confutatio sive Apologia Zenobio Acciolo Florentino interprete, Colonia 1532.

⁸ F. BALDELLI, *Filostrato Lemnio della Vita di Apollonio Tianeio*, Firenze 1549.

⁹ *De la Vie d'Apollonius Thianéen* par B. de Vignère Bourbonnois, Paris 1559.

¹⁰ Known to me from B. Castillon's publication of Philostratus' *Vie d'Apollonius de Tyane* avec les Commentaires données en anglais par Charles Blount, Berlin 1774.

¹¹ *Philostratorum quae supersunt Omnia*, Lipsiae 1709.

attempts to undermine the authority of the Church in the first century A.D. They also warn their contemporaries against putting faith in the miracles worked by the prophet of Tyana. They claim that the miracles were either invented by a deceitful Apollonius who hated Christianity, or, what is worse they testify to Apollonius' real collaboration with the devil ¹².

We find similar opinions in some of the works pertaining to the Polish Renaissance literature of the 16th century. The figure of Apollonius the magician occupies much space in a work written by Stanislaw from Góry Poklatecki and directed against all magical practices ¹³. The author regards Apollonius' views and deeds as "forbidden things" which lead people to "eternal damnation". Poklatecki treats Apollonius' magical practices as a typical example of devilish sorcery, even though, as he himself admits, some Christian authors of the Roman Empire included them in natural sorcery. Moreover, Poklatecki points out Apollonius' "magic practices" in order to testify to the existence of the devil in the world ¹⁴. According to him, Apollonius' miracles and his ability to change his location in space belong to the basic arsenal of devilish arts. Besides, Poklatecki thunders at the theory of metempsychosis which Apollonius advanced within his Pythagorean philosophy.

Piotr Skarga does not differ much in his opinion on Apollonius which he presents in his *History of the Church* ¹⁵. In this loose translation of Cezare Baronio's

¹² Among others Joannis Bodini Andegawensis, *De Magorum Daemonomania seu Detestando Lamiarum ac Magorum cum Satana commercio*, Libri IV recens recogniti et multis in locis a mendis repurgati. Accepit eiusdem opinionum Joannis Wieri confutatio non minus docta quam pia, Frankfurt 1603, p. 227.

¹³ *Pogrom czarnoksieskie bledy*, Kraków 1595; Poklatecki's views are discussed by Bugaj, op. cit., p. 145-146.

¹⁴ Poklatecki, op. cit., Bk. III.

¹⁵ *The Annals of the Church from the Birth of Our Lord Jesus Christ*. Extracted from Cezare Baronio's *Annals of the Church* by Piotr Skarga. Kraków 1607, pp. 51, 65.

History of the Church Skarga gives a colourful rendering of Apollonius' life which bore the stamp of his relationship with devilish powers. Being carried through the whole of the Mediterranean world by his "devilish adjuvants" Apollonius worked wonders and foretold the future. We know about his activities thanks to Philostratus who: "his acts described very eloquently prasing his might and those devilish miracles with a great and shameless lie". Skarga (Baronio) thinks that what was most dangerous for the reader of Philostratus' biographical work was the fact that Apollonius "with his devilish power" was active when "Christ's Gospel was beginning to gather momentum". Philostratus' work raised doubts in many Christians: "as there were those, and especially one Hierocles, a judge in the Areopagus, who wrote against Christianity and made this servant of the devil in his miracles equal to Christ, and it even came to pass that pagans built churches to that Apollonius and that they worshipped him after his death and that they sought his help in divers of their needs". The fact that this "accursed sorcerer" denounced St. John the Evangelist to the emperor's officials in Ephesus, thus bringing about his exile to Patmos, Skarga found most atrocious. The end of Apollonius' life was tragic and mirrored the kind of life he led, as "by the devils taken, he was killed".

Baronio's views, thanks to Skarga's translation known in Polish literature, influenced historians of the Church in the 17th century. They are echoed in C. Fleury's work¹⁶ and particularly in A. Godeau's *History of the Church*¹⁷. They were also assimilated by historians of the Roman Empire.

¹⁶ *Histoire Ecclesiastique*, Paris 1691, vol. I, pp. 20-22.

¹⁷ *Histoire de l'Église*, Lyon 1697.

Godeau, a bishop of Venice and a historian of the Church, was a leading representative of the instrumental trend. As a historian he utilized the same sources as his predecessors. However, he differed with them about their interpretation. What is striking about Godeau's views is the seriousness of the gravest accusations he brings against Apollonius, a seriousness which in his case is well-founded. It is because Godeau considers Apollonius the greatest enemy of the Church in its history¹⁸. The author does not lack arguments in support of his thesis. He repeats a common belief that Apollonius, posturing as Christ, was base enough to attempt overthrowing Christianity. He points out with indignation cases of Christians who apostatised from their faith in the first centuries A.D. and: "who, although they knew that Apollonius had been a liar and magician, also doubted miracles worked by Christ and his pupils"¹⁹.

Godeau refers to the ninth chapter of *The Revelation* of St. John the Divine as his fundamental source. The text provides many possibilities of loose exegesis. Apart from horses, seven horsemen, and four angels of destruction, the ninth chapter of *The Revelation* contains a description of creatures with long hair and with the teeth of lions who prey on other people's property, who murder, rape, and work charms, and whose king is the angel of the bottomless pit: in Hebrew he is named "Abaddon", whereas in Greek, APOLLYON. In Latin he is called "Exterminans" (I IX XI).

Godeau, who learnt about the history of the conflict be-

¹⁸ Godeau, op. cit., p. 356; similar views were expressed by J.B. Bossuet, *Oeuvres, complètes*, Paris 1828, Vol. XIII (*L'Apocalypse ou Révélation de S. Jean Apôtre*), p. 109.

¹⁹ Godeau writes: "Le demon semble l'avoir mis au monde, selon ses propres panégyristes vers la même temps que Jésus-Christ y voulut paraître, ou pour balancer son autorité dans l'esprit de ceux qui prendrait les illusions de ce magicien pour de vrais miracles ou afin que ceux qui le reconnaîtraient pour un vrai fourbe, et pour un magicien, fussent portés à douter aussi des merveilles de Jésus-Christ et de ses disciples" (op. cit., p. 366).

tween Apollonius and St. John which had taken place in Ephesus from Church tradition, does not doubt that it was the philosopher of Tyana whom St. John regarded as the arch Destroyer incarnate, and his followers as a band of evil spirits. The image of Apollonius as the angel of the abyss who had sowed destruction entered literature and influenced a common attitude towards this Pythagorean philosopher.

Godeau's preposterous assumptions subsequently found their breeding ground in a historical work by M. Lenaine de Tillemont²⁰. This outstanding historian of the Roman Empire repeats indiscriminately Godeau's views, adding his own arguments to support his theory. Among others, he claims that with the help of Apollonius demons meant to match the deeds of the Apostles which the latter performed thanks to Christ. Moreover, Apollonius' appearance had been prepared a long time ago as many prophecies contained in the writings of pagan philosophers and poets can testify. In their shape they remind the prophecies comprised in the *Old Testament* which concern Christ. Although Tillemont has been criticized for the naivety of his views several times, he showed much common sense in his links with religious and political trends prevailing at the court of the Severi; he also provided a comprehensive study of the historical sources which correspond to VA²¹.

The name of Apollonius, the leader of evil spirits, appears in works about magic and demonology, from among which it is worth mentioning a peculiar book written by Philaleutherus Helvetius²². Besides, the figure of Apollonius constantly recurred in theological writings.

²⁰ *Histoire des Empereurs et des autre Princes*, Bruxelles 1711, vol. II, pp. 195-216.

²¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 197-216.

²² *De Miraculis, quae Pythagorae, Apollonio Tyanensis, Francisco Assisio, Dominico et Ignatio Loyolae tribuuntur*, Duaci 1734. This work is discussed

In 1754 P.D. Huetius, a bishop of Avranches, condemned all the authors who had written about Apollonius in a friendly way, in his treatise *Demonstratio Evangelica*²³. In particular, he attacked the bishop Sidonius Apollinaris who, as we remember, was an ardent defender of Apollonius at the time when unfavourable views on, and attitudes towards, the Tyanean dominated in the Church. Huetius accuses the bishop of falling "into the snares of lies" which led him "to believe this scoundrel of Tyana". There is yet another significant detail in Huetius' considerations which attracts attention. Huetius holds that Philostratus' real aim was to copy the *Gospel* and to square Apollonius' life to the history of Christ's life. As a result, the author thinks, he produced an ineffective imitation full of lies: "manifesto apparent totam mendaciis ac fallaci loquentia consutam esse Philostrati historiam; doctrinaque eum sua haudquaquam tamen satis acute et solerter, imo vero inscite et inepte, ad ludificandos homines, consarcinandasque fabulas valde esse abusum"²⁴. However, by paying attention to the dependence of Philostratus' work on the *Gospel*, Huetius initiated the studies of the problem which became an important subject matter of scholarly treatises concerning Philostratus' biographical work in the 19th and 20th centuries.

The final attack on Apollonius' teachings was launched by a German scholar J.B. Lüderwald in his work under the significant title *Antihierocles oder Jesus Christus in ihrer grossen Engleichheit vorgestellt*²⁵. In a synthetic way the author sums up the results of the studies on the problem of Apollonius of Tyana. He agrees with the view on

by B. Baur (in) *Drei Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der Alten Philosophie und ihres Verhältnisses zum Christentum*, Leipzig 1876, pp. 672-678.

²³ Venetiis 1754, vol. I, pp. 672-678.

²⁴ Ibid., p. 677.

²⁵ Halle 1793.

Apollonius' thaumaturgic frauds; however, he passes over in silence Godeau's extreme opinions. The bulk of his work comprises effective comparisons between the *Life of Apollonius* and the *Gospel*, between Apollonius and Christ, Apollonius' pupils and the Apostles, and finally between the kind of religiousness and the system of ethical principles created by both teacher-reformers. In conclusion he fully affirms the *Gospel* as the only source and testimony of faith. According to him Philostratus' work does not deserve to be compared with the *Gospel* because of its naive and fabulous character; he ridicules Apollonius as a common sorcerer, claiming at the same time that it was only Christ who had the power of working miracles.

The above examples demonstrate that the figure of Apollonius was much discussed in the circles of the Church in the 17th and 18th centuries, and that Philostratus' work — as literary material — remained a threat to the Church. The atmosphere pervading the aforementioned works resembles very much the one prevailing in the church fighting against the Reformation and heretics in the 17th century. The sources of reformatory tendencies were traced back to religious and philosophical literature of a pagan origin as well. That is why the studies of Philostratus' work conducted at that time were confined to none too creative imitations of the views once expressed by the Fathers of the Church, usually ill-disposed and hostile to the Tyanean.

In the second half of the 17th century English deists entered a strong protest against the attitude of the Church towards Apollonius. The year 1680 marks the beginning of a real ideological struggle with the Church initiated by a deist Ch. Blount. Known because of his radical views, Blount published the first two books of VA in London in the same year, and provided them with an anti-Church introduction and commentaries by the obstinate deist Lord Herbert of Cherbury. Blount, who used to provoke public

opinion, treated Philostratus' work as a vehicle for combating the principles of revealed religions. He took advantage of Philostratus' work in order to prove both the superiority of universal religion over particular religions generated in various cultures, and the similarity of moral principles laid down by Christ and Apollonius in spite of differences in metaphysics. While discussing the notion of the only and universal God, Blount gives the same significance to Christ's miracles as to those performed by Apollonius²⁶.

The commentaries in Blount's edition scoff at the Church views on the Tyanean, the ignorance of the clergy and inanity of the Church's teachings. Parochial religiosity of clergymen is contrasted here with natural religiousness of pagans whose ancient apostle was, according to both deists, Apollonius of Tyana himself.

Blount's publication, severely condemned by the Church in 1693, circulated in Europe in a small size edition. In the same year the rebellious English deist committed suicide²⁷.

It was only in 1809 that VA was translated into English and published in its entirety thanks to the clergyman Ed. Berwick. He hastened to make it clear that the only reason for his publishing Philostratus' work was to counteract insinuations made by the famous historian E. Gibbon who, Berwick claimed, had had the nerve to compare Apollonius with Christ in his historical work. Berwick wrote: "I have only now to add, that had any English translation of the work existed, I should not have undertaken the present

²⁶ Cf. note 22; P. Bayle, even in 1820 in his *Dictionnaire historique et critique*, Paris 1820, vol. II, pp. 188-196, writes with indignation about Blount's edition which, he thinks, deeply shocked all righteous souls: "a furieusement scandalisée de bonnes âmes" (p. 189).

²⁷ He either shot or starved himself having learnt that the Church authorities had not allowed him to marry a sister of his wife (Bayle, op. cit., p. 190).

one, which is submitted with the greatest deference to the public, in the hope that it fully serve to set in its true light the character of Apollonius and to wipe away an uncandid insinuations of Mr Gibbon, who seems glad (*as he does on every occasion*) to fix a stigma on the Divine Author our religion: an insinuation which I believe he never would have made, had any translation of the work been extant in his own language, to which the reader might have had an easy access. The insinuation I allude to, is couched in a note to the first volume of his Roman History, in which he wishes to confound the character of our blessed Saviour, with that of an impostor and a magician, though the dissimilarity in every point of view, is so great between the two persons, that one is surprised how the liberal candour of a gentleman and a scholar could adopt it, and give it to a discerning public. In fine, if I should succeed in removing this unfair and unfounded imputation, I will think myself well repaid for the time and trouble expended in this work”²⁸. However, what Edward Gibbon “dared” to write is that: “Apollonius of Tyana was born about the same time as Jesus Christ. His life (that of the former) is related in so fabulous a manner by his fanatic disciples, that we are at a loss to discover whether he was a sage, or an impostor”²⁹.

From the 17th century onwards, Apollonius made his way in to English secular literature as well. Robert Burton in his *Anatomy of Melancholy* (1621) quotes a story from VA about Apollonius and a woman-vampire (lamia) who had designs on the life of a beautiful youth Mennipus. John Keats also utilized Burton’s work in his poem *Lamia* (1819).

Approximately at the same time, that is in the second half of the 18th century, Apollonius gained a widespread

²⁸ Cf. Bowersock (in) Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius*, op. cit., p. 20.

²⁹ Cf. note 22.

popularity in intellectual circles forwarding the Enlightenment. The writers of that period who studied Philostratus' work were even able to find in it the germ of ethical and religious ideas of the Enlightenment.

Blount's work, which had sunk into oblivion, regained its popularity thanks to a French scholar and philologist B. Castillon connected with the Enlightenment movement. In 1774 he published in Berlin the *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* whose first two books were a re-edition of Blount's work. The introduction to Castillon's edition, in the form of a dedication, is addressed to Pope Clement XIV. It was written by the King of Prussia, Frederic II the Great himself. With a characteristic maliciousness, Frederic II, disguised as Philalethes, reminds the Pope of Tillemont's views on Apollonius' demonological role in the world, and encourages him to give a decisive battle to this ambassador of the hell. He advises the Pope to consolidate the power of the Church to combat spreading superstitions. The Prussian king does not doubt that it would add to the Pope's glory and strengthen the position of the Church in the world. However, the sarcastic ruler suggests that the Pope should aim his first blow at the order of the Jesuits as it was the foremost abode of the devil in the world.

Castillon's edition with Frederic's malicious dedication gained so wide publicity that in 1779 it was published again in Amsterdam. Soon it was followed by works defending Apollonius against groundless accusations made by the Church.

First in Germany A.L. Cotta wrote an apology of Apollonius³⁰. The author, named a "German Hierocles" because of his support given to the Apollonius cause, defend-

³⁰ *Gewissheit der Beweise des Apollonismus* von Aemilius Liccinus Cotta, Oberpriester bei dem Temple des Jupiter Capitolinus zu Rom, aus dem Lateinischen übersetzt von dem Verfasser des Hierocles, Frankfurt und Leipzig 1787.

ed Apollonius' philosophical and religious activities against false accusations. Moreover, he claimed Apollonius had set up a new religious persuasion which was spread in Rome in the first century and considerably threatened Christianity.

Also M.A. Voltaire, who followed the same intellectual trend as Blount and Castillon, was lavish in the praise given to Apollonius³¹.

J.B. Legrand d'Aussy was the first who revised the existing editions of VA in France. In 1809 this follower of the Enlightenment published his loose but fluent literary translation of Philostratus' work in Paris³². He highly praised achievements of deism and rationalism of the 18th century, so conducive to the development of scholarly studies. He admired his own century when one could express independent views on Apollonius without fearing the "Church censorship and Bastille dungeons". Contrary to previous opinions on Apollonius which regarded him as a destroyer of Christian religion and a false wonder-worker, Legrand d'Aussy presents him as a sage having strict ethical principles and impeccable manners whose inborn skills allowed him to know the secrets of nature, and whose knowledge made him versed in political matters.

In Polish literature it was I. Krasicki, a man of letters, who in graceful words rendered Apollonius' moral virtues and held him up as a model to be followed by all philosophers³³.

At the turn of the 18th century one could notice that writing about Apollonius came into fashion. Comparisons drawn between Apollonius and Christ became elementary

³¹ *Essais sur les Moeurs et L'Esprit des Nations*, Paris 1817, vol. I, p. 146.

³² It is worth mentioning also M.A. Chassang's next French edition of *Apollonius de Tyane, sa Vie, ses Voyages, ses Prodiges*, Paris 1862, and a still useful German edition by C.L. KAYSER, *Flavii Philostrati quae supersunt*, Zürich 1844.

³³ DZIELA, Warszawa 1804, vol. VII, pp. 315-323.

exercises demonstrating erudition and literary skill of young European intellectuals. For instance, even Napoleon Bonaparte himself, as a young Lieutenant of artillery, took up the pen and followed the general trend³⁴.

The beginning of the 19th century marks the starting point of a non-instrumental trend in the literature devoted to Apollonius. We do not intend to discuss the works belonging to this trend in the present book. They do not have to be recalled in any particular way as usually they are contained in bibliographical lists of every more comprehensive scholarly work on Philostratus and his book. Let us mention then only those of them which provided the basis for modern studies on VA and on the figure of Apollonius.

The first representative of this trend we can trace back to the beginning of the 18th century. In 1709 M.J. Ch. Herzog³⁵ dared to present a systematic account of Apollonius' Pythagorean philosophy of life, in spite of a raging intolerance. The author, free from any trace of partiality and inflexible to prevailing tendencies, directed his efforts at bringing the figure of Apollonius closer to its historical prototype.

P. Wielands³⁶ followed this trend of studies and put his main emphasis on the analysis of Philostratus' biographical work (especially on Damis' relation). He came to the conclusion that all the real descriptions contained in the

³⁴ Cf. JESSEN, *Apollonius von Tyana und sein Biograph Philostratus*, Hamburg 1885, p. 7.

³⁵ *Philosophian practicam Apolonii Tyanaei in Sciagraphia*, Lipsiae 1709; an ambivalent attitude was adopted by. G. NANDE PARISIEN, *Apologie pour les grands Hommes soupçonnez de Magie*, Amsterdam 1712, pp. 204-221, who praises Apollonius for his ethical virtues. However, he follows Huetius in his belief that Philostratus' work not only imitates the *Gospel* but also ridicules it (pp. 209-210). It seems that Nande Parisien repeats, though without conviction, official views.

³⁶ *Agathodämon* (in) *Sämtliche Werke*, Karlsruhe 1816, Vol. 32.

biography were derived from Damis' memoirs who had been Apollonius' pupil. According to the author one could not blame Philostratus for distorting the facts of Apollonius' life. He also adopted a rational approach to Apollonius' miracles which he considered highly probable (for instance, he points out Apollonius' medical knowledge as an explanation of his rising a little girl from the dead in Rome). In Wielands' work Apollonius is a happy man of antiquity, full of various virtues.

The non-instrumental trend also comprises polemical works whose authors held that the figure of Apollonius — so suggestively outlined by Philostratus — corresponded to the historical Apollonius³⁷, or alternatively, that the true Apollonius was in fact a swindler and charlatan³⁸.

Literature devoted to magic and occultism developed quite a different image of Apollonius³⁹ which attracted the attention of men of letters who had a predilection for utilizing some elements of magic and fantasy in their literary works⁴⁰.

The era of loose non-academic speculations on the figure of the Tyanean came to its end in the 19th century⁴¹.

³⁷ J. GÖTTSCHEG, *Apollonius von Tyana*, Diss. Leipzig 1889; G.H. PETTERSEH, *Apollonius von Tyana der Heiden Heiland*, eine philosophische Studie, Reichenberg 1879; F. BALZER, *Apollonius von Tyana, übersetzt und erläutert*, Rudolstadt 1883; L. NOACK, *Apollonius von Tyana, Ein Christusbild des Heidentums*, Psyche I (2) 1858, pp. 1-24.

³⁸ J. Jessen, op. cit., E. MÜLLER, *War Apollonius von Tyana ein Weiser oder ein Betrüger, oder ein Schwärmer und Fanatiker?* Breslau 1861.

³⁹ E. LEVI, *Histoire de la Magie*, Paris 1922, p. 232; A. DOERGENS, *Apollonius von Tyana in Parallele zur Christus dem Herrn*, Theologie und Glaube, Paderborn 1933, vol. 25.

⁴⁰ Among others G. FLAUBERT in *La Tentation de Saint-Antoine* (cf. J. SEZNEC, "Le Christ du Paganisme" - *Apollonius de Tyane et Flaubert* repr. from Essays in Honor of Albert Feuillerat, Yale Romanic Studies, vol. XIII, Yale 1943); T. GAUTIER, *Awatar*, Kraków 1976, p. 32.

⁴¹ Yet even in the 20th century there are works published which indiscriminately repeat Philostratean stories about Apollonius (cf. G.R.S. MEAD, *Apollonius*

However, Godeau's and Tillemont's views, were preserved in philosophical literature of the turn of the same century. W. Soloviev, a philosopher belonging to the generation of Russian mystics, made Apollonius of Tyana the hero of his *Brief Story about the Antichrist*⁴², written as a sort of historical and philosophical commentary to *The Revelation* of St. John the Divine.

The story presents an apocalyptic tragedy of Europe spiritually prostrated after a raid of the Mongolians. A secular ruler, the Antichrist, who follows only a positive law, acquires power over Europe which slowly rises from its decay. The ruler, who denies God's laws, asks the magician Apollonius of Tyana, a False Prophet who came from the East, to help him in his reign. Thanks to his conjuring skills and magic Apollonius soon manages to exert influence on people. Chosen as the Pope he banishes Christian bishops, and replaces previous liturgy with mysterious forms of the cult. The author closes his drama with a sudden intervention of the Providence which totally annihilates the evil and brings about the fall both of the Antichrist and the False Prophet.

The history of this dramatic reign is related in accordance with the thirteenth chapter of *The Revelation* (XIII 11) which mentions the second beast serving the first one, that is the False Prophet serving the Antichrist. The Antichrist's rule, supported by the False Prophet, comes to

of Tyana, the Philosopher - Reformer of the first Century a.d., a critical Study of the one existing Record of his Life, with some Account of the War of Opinion concerning him, and an Introduction to the religious Associations and Brotherhoods of the Times and the possible Influence of Indian Thought on Greece, London-Benares 1901, rep. New York 1966), pp. 1-10, or recently J.L. BERNARD, *Apollonius de Tyana et Jésus*, Paris 1977.

⁴² Known to me from a Polish edition of this work: Poznan 1924. Recently the figure of Apollonius came back to belles-lettres in Ch. Olson's drama *Apollonius of Tyana* which I know in its Polish version published in *Literatura na świecie* 12 (44), 1974, pp. 125-145.

its end as the nineteenth chapter of *The Revelation* does: ... “And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that worshipped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone...” (XIX 19-20).

With this rather eccentric vision of the next stage of the existence of Europe we conclude the discussion of the early works on Apollonius which have their roots the Renaissance. We have discussed recent works at length both in the Introduction and throughout the present work.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

(This bibliography lists all books and articles mentioned in the notes and Appendix, except for the following: articles in works of reference, encyclopedias, dictionaries, lexicons, handbooks, editions of literary texts, coins, inscriptions and papyri).

- A. ALFÖLDI, *The Conversion of Constantine and Pagan Rome*, Oxford 1948.
- A. ALFÖLDI, *Die Kontorniaten. Ein Verkanntes Propagandamittel der Städ-römische heidnischen Aristokratie in ihrem Kampfe gegen das christliche Kaisertum*, Festvortrag gehalten am 9 Mai 1941, Budapest 1943.
- P. ALLARD, *Julien l'Apostate*, Paris 1906.
- G. ANDERSON, *Studies in Lucian's Comic Fiction*, Leiden 1976.
- A.H. ARMSTRONG (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy*, Cambridge 1967.
- J. BABELON, *Impératrices Syriennes*, Paris 1957.
- A. BALLANTI, *Documenti sull'opposizione degli intellettuali a Domiziano*, Annali della facoltà di letteratura e filologia dell'Università di Napoli IV, 1954, pp. 76-95.
- T.D. BARNES, *Prophyry against the Christians, Date and the Attribution of Fragments*, The Journal of Theological Studies XXIV, 1973, pp. 437-442.
- T.D. BARNES, *Sossianus Hierocles and the Antecedents of the Great Persecution*, Harvard Studies in Classical Philology 80, 1976, pp. 239-252.
- F. BAUR, *Apollonius von Tyana und Christus oder das Verhältniss des Pythagoreismus zur Christentum* (in) *Drei Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der alten Philosophie und Ihres Verhältnisses zum Christentum*, ed. E. Zeller, Leipzig 1876.
- L. BELLONI, *Aspetti dell'antica ΣΟΦΙΑ in Apollonio di Tiana*, Aevum, Rassegna di scienze storiche, linguistiche e filologiche LIV, 1, 1980, pp. 140-149.
- J.L. BERNARD, *Apollonius de Tyana et Jésus*, Paris 1977.

- M. BERTHELOT, *Histoire des sciences, La chimie au Moyen Âge*, doctrines et pratiques chimique I-III, Paris 1893.
- E.J. BICKERMANN, *Syria and Cilicia*, American Journal of Philology 68, 1947, pp. 352-360.
- J. BIDEZ, *Vie de Porphyre, le philosophe néo-platonicien*, Gand-Leipzig 1913.
- J. BIDEZ, F. CUMONT, *Les Mages Hellénisés, Zoroaster, Ostanès et Hystaspe d'après la tradition grecque*, I-II, Paris 1938.
- L. BIELER, ΘΕΙΟΣ ANEP. Das Bild des «göttlichen Menschen» in Spätantike und Frühchristentum, I-II, Wien 1935-1936.
- A. BIRLEY, *The Lacuna in the Historia Augusta* (in) Bonner Historia Augusta-Colloquium 1975/76, Antiquitas, Reihe 4 (Beiträge zur Historia Augusta Forschung Bd. 13) Bonn 1978.
- E. BIRLEY, *Fresh Thoughts on the Dating of the Historia Augusta* (in) Bonner Historia Augusta Colloquium 1975/76, Antiquitas, Reihe 4 (Beiträge zur Historia Augusta Forschung Bd. 13), Bonn 1978.
- H. BLOCH, *The Pagan Revival in the West at the End of the Fourth Century* (in) The Conflict between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century (ed. A. Momigliano) Oxford 1963.
- H. BLOCH, *A New Document of the Last Pagan Revival in the West*, Harvard Theological Review 38, 1945, pp. 199-241.
- C. BLUM, *The Meaning of Stoicheion and its Derivates in the Byzantine Age*, Eranos 44, 1946, pp. 315-320.
- F. BOLL, *Aus der Offenbarung Johannis*, Hellenistische Studien zum Weltbild der Apokalypse, Leipzig-Berlin 1914 (2nd, Amsterdam 1967).
- J. BOMPAIRE, *Lucien écrivain, imitation et création*, Paris 1958.
- C. BONNER, *Magical Amulets*, Harvard Theological Review 39, 1946, pp. 24-28.
- B. BOSSUET, *Oeuvres complètes XXII*, Paris 1828.
- D. BOWDER, *The Age of Constantine and Julian*, London 1978.
- G.W. BOWERSOCK, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire*, Oxford 1969.
- E.L. BOWIE, *Apollonius of Tyana: Tradition and Reality*, ANRW, Teil II: Principat, 16, 2, 1978, pp. 3-41.
- E.L. BOWIE, *Greeks and their Past in the Second Sophistic*, Past and Present 46, 1970, pp. 3-41.

- A.S. BRADFORD, *The Synarchia of Roman Sparta*, Chiron 10, 1980, pp. 424-426.
- P. BROWN, *The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity*, The Journal of Roman Studies 61, 1971, pp. 80-101.
- P.R.L. BROWN, *Aspects of Christianisation of the Roman Aristocracy*, Journal of Roman Studies 51, 1961, pp. 1-11.
- P. BROWN, *The Cult of the Saints. Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity* (The Harshell Lectures on History of Religious, New Series, No 2, ed. J. Kitagawa), Chicago 1981.
- R. BUGAJ, *Nauki tajemne w Polsce w dobie Odrodzenia*, Wroclaw 1976.
- A. CALDERINI, *Teoria e pratica politica nella «Vita di Apollonio di Tiana»*. Rendiconti dell'Istituto Lombardo, Classe di lettere scienze morali e storiche 74, 1940-1941, pp. 213-241.
- F.W.G. CAMPBELL, *Apollonius of Tyana, A Study of his Life and Times*, London 1908.
- M. CASTER, *Lucien et la pensée religieuse de son temps*, Paris 1937.
- P. CHARLESWORTH, *The Virtues of the Roman Emperor*, Proceedings of the British Academy XXIII, 1937, pp. 100-114.
- J. CHARPENTIER, *The Indian Travels of Apollonius of Tyana* (in) Skifter utgivna av. K. Humanistika Vetenskaps-Samfundet i Uppsala 29, 3, 1934, pp. 1-66.
- A. CHASTAGNOL, *Recherches sur l'Histoire Auguste avec un rapport sur les progrès de la Historia Augusta-Forschung depuis 1963* (in) Bonner Historia Augusta - Colloquium 1968, Antiquitas, Reihe 4 (Beiträge zur Historia Augusta Forschung, Bd. 10), Bonn 1972.
- K.M.T. CHRIMES, *Ancient Sparta, a Re-examination of the Evidence*, Manchester 1949.
- E. CIZEK, *L'Èpoque de Néron et ses controverses idéologique*, Leiden 1972.
- A.L. COTTA, *Gewissheit der Beweise des Apollonismus...* Leipzig 1787.
- L. CRACCO-RUGGINI, *Sulla cristianizzazione della cultura pagana: il mito greco e latino di Alessandro dell'età Antoniniana al Medio Evo*, Athenaeum 1965, N.S. 43, pp. 3-80.
- T.W. CRAFER, *The Apocriticus of Macarios Magnes*, London-New York 1919.
- F.H. CRAMER, *Astrology in Roman Law and Politics*, Philadelphia 1954.

- F. CUMONT, *Alexandre d'Abonutichos et le Néopythagorisme*, Revue d'Histoire des Religions 86, 1922, pp. 200-215.
- F. CUMONT, *Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, 4th ed. Paris 1929.
- F. CUMONT, *Die Mysterien des Mithra, Ein Beitrag zur Religionsgeschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Leipzig 1911.
- G. DAGRON, J. MARCILLET-JAUBERT, *Inscriptions de Cilicie et d'Isaurie*, Türk Tarih Kurumu Belleten 42, 1978, pp. 402-405.
- D. DEL CORNO, *Lo scritto di Filostrato su Apollonio Tiano e la tradizione della narrativa* (in) *La struttura della fabulazione antica*, Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto di filologia classica e medievale 54, Genova 1979, pp. 65-87.
- E. DEMOUGEOT, *Flavius Vopiscus est-il Nicomache Flavien?*, Antiquité Classique 22, 1953, pp. 361-382.
- J. DILLON, *The Middle Platonists, a study of Platonism 80 B.C. - A.D. 200*, Duckworth, London 1977.
- A. DOERGENS, *Apollonius von Tyana in parallele zu Christus dem Herrn*, Theologie und Glaube 25, Paderborn 1933.
- E.R. DOODS, *Pagan and Christian in the Age of Anxiety*, Cambridge 1965.
- G. DOWNEY, *A History of Antioch in Syria*, Princeton 1961.
- W.L. DULIÈRE, *Protection permanente contre des animaux nuisible assurée par Apollonius de Tyane dans Byzance et Antioche*. Evolution de son mythe, Byzantinische Zeitschrift 63, 1970, pp. 247-277.
- M. DZIELSKA (M. JÓZEFOWICZ-DZIELSKA), *La participation du milieu d'Alexandrie à la discussion sur l'idéal du souverain dans les deux premiers siècles de l'Empire Romain*, Eos LXIV, 1976, pp. 43-58.
- M. DZIELSKA (M. JÓZEFOWICZ), *Les idées politiques dans la morale stoiciens de Marc-Aurèle*, Eos LIX, 1971, pp. 241-254.
- M. DZIELSKA (M. JÓZEFOWICZ-DZIELSKA), *Review of J. Palm, Om Filostratos och Hans Apollonius-Biografi*, Eos LXVI, 1978, pp. 331-333.
- M. DZIELSKA (M. JÓZEFOWICZ), *W kregu teoretyczno-ustrojowych zagadnien filozofii stoicko-cynickiej pierwszych dwu wieków cesarstwa rzymskiego*, Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego CCCLXIV, Prace Historyczne z. 50, 1974, pp. 7-30.

- W. ECK, *Testamentum Dasumi*, Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 30, 1978, pp. 290-295.
- E.J., L. EDELSTEIN, *Asclepius. A Collection and Interpretation of the Testimonies I*, Baltimore 1944.
- D. ESSER, *Formgeschichtliche Studien zur hellenistischen und zur frühchristlichen Literatur unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der vita Apollonii des Philostrat und der Evangelien*, Diss. Bonn 1969.
- J. FERGUSON, *The Religions of the Roman Empire* (Aspects of Greek and Roman Life ed. by H.H. Scullard), London 1970.
- A.J. FESTUGIÈRE, *La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste I, L'astrologie et les sciences occultes*, Paris 1944.
- C. FLEURY, *Histoire Ecclesiastique I*, Paris 1691.
- Phileleutherus Helvetius, *De miraculis quae Pythagorae, Apollonio Tyanensis, Francisco Assisio, Dominico et Ignatio Loyolae tribuuntur*, Duaci 1734.
- J. GAGÉ, «Basiléia», *Les Césars, les rois d'Orient et les Mages*, Paris 1968.
- T. GAUTIER, *Awatar*, Kraków 1976.
- J. GEFFCKEN, *Der Ausgang des griechisch-römischen Heidentums* (Religionswissenschaftliche Bibliothek 16), Heidelberg 1926.
- D. GHEZZI, *Apollonio di Tiana nella storia e leggenda*, Rivista storico-critica delle scienze teologiche VI, 5, pp. 364-390.
- G. GIANNELLI, S. MAZZARINO, *Trattato di storia romana II*, Roma 1962.
- E. GIBBON, *Zmierzch cesarstwa rzymskiego II*, Warszawa 1960.
- A. GODEAU, *Apollonius von Tyana*, Leipzig 1889.
- J. GÖTTSCHING, *Apollonius von Tyana*, Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 46, 1892, pp. 466-470.
- P. GRIMAL, *Deux figures de la correspondance de Pline: le philosophe Euphratès et le rhéteur Isée*, Latomus XIV, 1955, pp. 370-383.
- B. HARRIS, *Apollonius of Tyana: Fact and Fiction*, The Journal of Religious History 5, 3, 1969, pp. 189-199.
- W. HARTKE, *Geschichte und Politik in spätantiken Rom* (Untersuchungen über die Scriptores Historiae Augustae), Klio 6, 1949, pp. 74-81.
- J. HEMPEL, *Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung von Apollonius von Tyana*, Leipzig 1920.

- M.J. CH. HERZOG, *Philosophiam practicam Apolonii Tyanaei in sciagraphia*, Lipsiae 1709.
- R. HOISTAD, *Cynic Hero and Cynic King*, Uppsala 1948.
- TH. HOPFNER, *Die Brahmanen Indiens und die Gymnosophisten Agyptens in der Apollonios biographie des philostratos*, Archiv Orientalni 6, 1934, pp. 58-67.
- H. JÄGER, *Die Quellen des Porphyrios in seiner Pythagoras - Biographie*, Diss. Zürich 1919.
- J. JESSEN, *Apollonius von Tyana und sein Biograph Philostratus*, Hamburg 1885.
- P. JOHNE, *Kaiserbiographie und senatsaristokratie. Untersuchungen zur Datierung und sozialen Herkunft der Historia Augusta*, (Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR, Zentralinstitut für alte Geschichte und Archaeologie Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur der Antike 15), Berlin 1976.
- C.P. JONES, *An Epigram on Apollonius of Tyana*, Journal of Hellenic Studies 100, 1980, pp. 190-194.
- C.P. JONES, *The Roman World of Dio Chrysostom*, Cambridge Mass., London 1978.
- C.P. JONES, *A Martyria for Apollonius of Tyana*, Chiron 12, 1982, pp. 137-144.
- M. KERTSCH, *Traditionelle Rhetorik und Philosophie in Eusebius Antirrhetikos gegen Hierokles*, Vigiliae Christianae 32, 2, 1980, pp. 145-171.
- E. KETTENHOFEN, *Die syrischen Augustae in der historischen Überlieferung* (Antiquitas Reihe 3, ser. in 4 to, Bd. 24), Bonn 1979.
- P. KRAUS, *Jābir ibn Hayyān. Contribution à l'histoire des idées scientifiques dans l'Islam II: Jabir et la science grecque* (Mémoires présentés à l'Institut d'Égypte 45), Le Caire 1942.
- AL. KRAWCZUK, *Julian Apostata*, Warszawa 1970.
- I. KRASICKI, *Dziela VII*, Warszawa 1804.
- P. DE LABRIOLLE, *La réaction paienne. Étude sur la polemique antichrétienne du Ier au VIe siècle*, Paris 1934.
- L. LECLERC, *De l'identité de Balinas et d'Apollonius de Tyane*, Journal Asiatique, ser 6, 14, 1869, pp. 111-131.
- J. LEGOWICZ, *Historia filozofii starożytnej Grecji i Rzymu*, Warszawa 1973.

- F. LEO, *Die griechisch-römische Biographie*, Leipzig 1901.
- G. LEVI DELLA VIDA, *La dottrina e i dodici legati di Stomathalassa*, Atti dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei 1951, Memorie, Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche, 8, 3, pp. 477-542.
- G. LEVI DELLA VIDA, *Something more about Artefius and his Clavis Sapientiae*, Speculum XIII, 1938, pp. 80-85.
- I. LÉVY, *Recherches sur les sources de la légende de Pythagore* (Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études sciences religieuses 42), Paris 1926.
- F. LO CASCIO, *La forma letteraria della Vita di Apollonio Tianeio*, Quaderno dell'Istituto di filologia classica dell'Università di Palermo 6, 1974.
- F. LO CASCIO, *Sulla autenticità delle epistole di Apollonio Tianeio*, Palermo 1978 (Istituto siciliano di studi bizantine e neoellenici, Quaderni 10; Ristampa dagli Atti dell'Accademia di scienze, lettere ed arti di Palermo XXXVI, II, 1978).
- P. LOYEN, *Études sur Sidoine Apollonai*, Revue des Études Latines XLVI 1968, pp. 85-86.
- D. MAGIE, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (to the End of the Third Century) I, Princeton 1950.
- L. MALUNOWICZ, *De ara Victoriae*, Wilno 1937.
- C. MANGO, *Antique Statuary and the Byzantine Beholder*, Dumbarton Oaks Papers 17, 1963, pp. 55-75.
- T. MANTERO, *Ricerche sull'Heroicos di Filostrato* (Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto di filologia classica dell'Università di Genova 21), Genova 1966.
- J.F. MATTHEWS, *The Historical Setting of the Carmen contra Paganos* (Cod. Par. Lat. 8084), Historia 19, 1970, pp. 464-479.
- S. MAZZARINO, *La propaganda senatoriale nel tardo impero*, Doxa 4, 1951, pp. 121-130.
- G.R.S. MEAD, *Apollonius of Tyana, The Philosopher - Reformer of the First Century A.D.A. critical Study of the only existing Record of his Life, with some Account of the War of Opinion concerning him, and an Introduction on the Religious Associations and Brotherhoods of the Times and the possible Influence of Indian Thought on Greece*, London-Benares 1901 (repr. New York 1966).
- R. MERKELBACH, *Das Epigram auf Apollonius von Tyana*, Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 41, 1981, p. 270.

- E. MEYER, *Apollonius von Tyana und die Biographie des Philostratus*, Hermes 52, 1917, pp. 371-424.
- F. MILLAR, *A Study of Cassius Dio*, Oxford 1964.
- F. MILLAR, *The Emperor in the Roman World (31 B.C.-A.D. 337)*, London 1977.
- K.I. MILLER, *Die Damispapiere in Philostratus Apollonios-Biographie*, Philologus 66, 1907, pp. 511-525.
- J. MOLES, *the Career and Conversion of Dio Chrysostom*, Journal of Hellenic Studies 98, 1978, pp. 79-100.
- M. MÜHL, *Die antike Menschheitsidee*, Leipzig 1928.
- E. MÜLLER, *Was Apollonius von Tyana ein Weiser oder ein Betrüger oder ein Schwärmer und Fanatiker?*, Breslau 1861.
- G. NANDE PARISIEN, *Apologie pour les grandes hommes soupçonnez de Magie*, Amsterdam 1712.
- F. NAU, *Une ancienne traduction latine du Bélionous arabe (Apoll. de Tyane)*, Revue de l'Orient chrétien, 2^e ser., XII, 1907, pp. 99-106.
- L. NOACK, *Apollonius von Tyana. Ein Christusbild des Heidentums*, Psyche I, 2, 1858, pp. 1-24.
- A.D. NOCK, *Conversion. The Old and the New in Religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine of Hippo*, Oxford 1933.
- A.D. NOCK, *Essays on Religion and the ancient World II*, Oxford 1972.
- A.D. NOCK, *The Cult of Heroes*, Harvard Theological Review 37, 1944, pp. 141-174 (Essays on Religion and the Ancient World II), Oxford 1972, pp. 575-602.
- TH. NÖLDEKE, *Die Orientalische Literatur. Die Kultur der Gegenwart I, VII*, Berlin - Leipzig 1906.
- E. NORDEN, *Agnostos Theos*, Untersuchungen zur Formgeschichte religiöser Rede, Leipzig-Berlin 1913.
- P. NOYEN, *Marcus Aurelius, The greatest Practician of Stoicism*, Antiquité Classique 24, 1955, pp. 272-383.
- J.J. O'DONNELL, *The Career of Virius Nicomachus Flavianus*, Phoenix XXXII, 1978, pp. 129-143.
- CH. OLSON, *Apolloniusz z Tiany (Apollonius of Tyana)*, Literatura na swiecie 12 (44), 1974, pp. 125-145.
- J. O'MEARA, *Porphyry's Philosophy from Oracles in Augustine*, Études Augustiniennes, Paris 1959.

- J. PALM, *Om Filostratos och Hans Apollonios-Biografi*, Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Studia Graeca Upsaliensia 10, Uppsala 1976.
- M. PANI, *Roma e i re d'Oriente da Augusto a Tiberio*, Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di lettere e filosofia dell'Università di Bari 11, Bari 1972.
- E. PASCHOUD, *Réflexions sur l'idéal religieux de Symmaque*, Historia 14, 1965, pp. 215-235.
- W. PEEK, *Epigramm auf Apollonius von Tyana*, Philologus 2 (125), 1981, pp. 297-298.
- R.J. PENELLA, *The Letters of Apollonius of Tyana. A critical Text with Prolegomena*, Translation and Commentary, Mnemosyne Supplementum 56, Leiden 1979.
- R.J. PENELLA, *Scopelianus and the Eretrians in Cissia*, Athenaeum 52, 1974, pp. 295-300.
- R.J. PENELLA, *Philostratus Letter to Julia Domna*, Hermes 107, 2, 1979, pp. 165-168.
- R.J. PENELLA, *An overlooked Story about Apollonius of Tyana in Anastasius Sinaita*, Traditio XXIV, 1978, pp. 414-415.
- F.E. PETERS, *The Harvest of Hellenism, a History of the Near East to the Triumph of Christianity*, New York 1970.
- G.H. PETTERSEH, *Apollonius von Tyana der Heiden Heiland, eine philosophische Studie*, Reichenberg 1879.
- G. PETZKE, *Die Traditionen über Apollonius von Tyana und das Neue Testament (Studia ad Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti I)*, Leiden 1970.
- M. PLESSNER, *Hermes Trismegistos and Arab Science*, Studia Islamica II, 1954, pp. 45-61.
- M. PLESSNER, *Neue Materialien zur Geschichte der Tabula Smaragdina*, Der Islam 16, 1927, pp. 77-113.
- S. POKLATECKI, *Z Gór, Progrom czarnoksieskie błedy...* (Fulmination of Sorcerer's Fallacies...), Kraków 1595.
- S. PRICOCO, *Sidonio Apollinare traduttore della Vita di Apollonio di Tiana di Filostrato*, Nuovo Didaskaleion XV, 1965, pp. 71-98.
- B.P. REARDON, *Courants littéraires Grecs de II^e et III^e siècles après J.-C.* (Annales Littéraires de l'Université de Nantes fasc. 3), Paris 1971.
- R. REITZENSTEIN, *Hellenistische Wundererzählungen*, Leipzig 1908.
- A. RENOUARD, *Annali delle edizioni Aldine*, Bologna 1953.

- J. RÉVILLE, *La religion à Rome sous les Sévères*, Paris 1885.
- J. RÉVILLE, *Le Christ païen du troisième siècle*, *Revue des deux mondes* 59, 1865, pp. 620-654.
- N.J. RICHARDSON, P. BURIAN, *The Epigram on Apollonius of Tyana*, *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 22, 3, 1981, pp. 283-285.
- D.M. ROBINSON, *An Analysis of the pagan Revival of the Late Fourth Century with special Reference to Symmachus*, *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 46, 1915, pp. 81-101.
- CH. ROBINSON, *Lucien and his Influence in Europe*, Dutchworth, London 1979.
- J. L. ROBERT, *Bulletin Épigraphique*, *Revue des Études grecques* XCII, 1979, no 592. (Épigramme d'Apollonius de Tyane).
- L. ROBERT, *De Cilicie à Messine et à Plymouth avec deux inscriptions grecque errantes*, *Journal des Savants* 1973, pp. 161-211.
- E. RHODE, *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*, Leipzig 1914.
- E. RHODE, *Die Quellen des Jamblichus in seiner Biographie des Pythagoras*, *Rheinisches Museum* 26, 1871, pp. 554-567, 27, 1872, pp. 23-61.
- M. ROKOSZ, *Wenecka oficyna Alda Manucjusza i Polska w orbicie jej wpływow*, Wrocław 1982.
- J. RUSKA, *Tabula Smaragdina*, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Hermetischen Literatur (Heidelberg Akten der von - Portheim-Stiftung 16), Heidelberg 1926.
- M. SALAMON, *Środowisko kultury łacińskiej w Konstantynopolu w IV w.* (Prace naukowe Uniwersytetu Śląskiego w Katowicach nr 206), Katowice 1971.
- H.J. SCHÜTZ, *Beiträge zur Formgeschichte synoptischer Wundererzählungen, dargestellt an der Vita Apollonii des Philostratus*, Diss. Jena 1953.
- S. SETTIS, *Severo Alessandro e i suoi lari*, *Athenaeum* 50, 1972, pp. 237-251.
- J. SEZNEC, «*Le Christ du Paganisme*» - *Apollonius de Tyane et Flaubert* (repr. from *Essays in Honor of A. Feuillerat*), *Yale Romanic Studies* XIII, Yale 1943, pp. 231-247.
- J.J. SHERIDAN, *The Altar of Victory-Paganism's Last Battle*, *l'Antiquité Classique* XXXV, 1960, pp. 186-206.
- T. SINKO, *Literatura grecka* V, III (1), Kraków 1951.

- V.A. SIRAGO, *Galla Placidia e la trasformazione politica dell'Occidente*, Louvain 1961.
- P. SKARGA, *Roczne dzieje kościelne od narodzenia Pana y Boga naszego Jezusa Chrystusa* (The Annals of the Church from the Birth of our Lord Jesus Christ), Kraków 1607.
- W. SMID, *Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern von Dionysius von Halikarnass bis auf den zweiten Philostratus IV*, Stuttgart 1896.
- M. SMITH, *Prolegomena to a Discussion of Aretalogies, Divine Man, the Gospels and Jesus*, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 92, 1973, pp. 405-416.
- W. SPEYER, *Zur Bild des Apollonius von Tyana bei Heiden und Christen*, *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 17, 1974, pp. 47-63.
- W. SOLOVIEV, *Krótką powieść o Antychryście* (Brief Story about the Antichrist), Poznań 1924.
- M. STAHL, *Imperiale Herrschaft und provinzielle Stadt*, *Hypomnemata* 52, Göttingen 1978.
- J. STRAUB, *Heidnische Geschichtsapologetik in der christlichen spätantike*, *Untersuchungen über Zeit und Tendenz der Historia Augusta Antiquitas*, Reihe 4, (Beiträge zur Historia Augusta Forschung Bd. 1), Bonn 1963.
- R. SYME, *Ammianus and the Historia Augusta*, Oxford 1968.
- B.L. TAGGART, *Apollonius of Tyana. His Biographers and Critics*, Diss. Tufts University 1972.
- H. TALBERT, *Biographies of Philosophers and Rulers in Mediterranean Antiquity*, ANRW, Teil II: Principat, 16, 2, Berlin New York 1978, pp. 1619-1651.
- L. THORNDIKE, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science I*, New York 1923.
- M. LENAINE DE TILLEMONT, *Histoire des empereurs et des autres prince II*, Bruxelles 1711.
- J.M.C. TOYNBEE, *Review of A. Alföldi, Die Kontorniat-Medaillons*, *Journal of Roman Studies* 35, 1945, pp. 115-121.
- A. TRELOAR, *Ethiopians*, *Prudentia* 4, 1972, pp. 42-50.
- G. TURTON, *The Syrian Princesses: The Women who ruled Rome, A.D. 193-235*, London 1974.
- M. ULLMANN, *Die Natur-und Geheimwissenschaften in Islam*, *Handbuch der Orientalistik*, Abt. 1, Bd. 6, 2, Leiden-Köln 1972.

- R. WAELKENS, *L'Économie, thème apologétique et principe herméneutique dans l'Apocriticos de Macarios Magnes* (Recueil de Travaux d'Histoire et de Philologie, VI^e série, fasc. 4, Louvain 1974).
- A. WALLON, *Asclepius, The Cult of the Greek God of Medicine*, Ithaca 1894 (rep. Chicago 1979).
- U. WEISSER, *Das Buch über das Geheimnis der Schöpfung von Pseudo Apollonius von Tyana* (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Quellenkunde der alten Medizin, III Abt., Bd. 2 Arabische Medizin), Berlin-New York 1980.
- P. WIELANDS, *Agathodämon* (in) *Sämtliche Werke* 32, Karlsruhe 1816.
- M.A. VOLTAIRE, *Essais sur les mœurs et l'esprit des nations* I, Paris 1817.
- A.N. ZADOKS-JOSEPHUS JITTA, *The Contorniates in the Royal Cabinet at the Hague*, *Mnemosyne* 4, 1951, pp. 82-85.
- J. ZEILLER, *L'Empire romain et l'Église* (Histoire du Monde V), Paris 1928.
- E. ZELLER, *Die Philosophie der Griechen in Ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung* 1, 2, Leipzig 1891.

INDEX OF CLASSICAL NAMES

- | | |
|--|--|
| Abraham 174 - 176 | Arnobius the Older 95 - 101 - 112 |
| Aelius Lampridius 174 | Artaxerxes 24 |
| Aeneas of Gaza 100 | Artemius 158 |
| Albinus 140 | Aristotle 106 - 163 - 170 - 182 |
| Alexander of Abonouteichos 86/88 | Asclepios 31 - 54 - 59 - 62/64 - 69 - 71 - 73 - 77 - 86 - 88 - 127 - 135 - 139 - 143 - 158 - 159/161 |
| Alexander Peloplaton 71 | Austūmūn (Astyūmūn, Abdarrahmān) 113 |
| Alexander the Great 60 - 86 | Atticus 139 |
| Al-Qazwīnī 112 | Augustine 139 - 179 |
| Amasis 93 | Aurelian 58 - 78 - 175 - 176 - 181 |
| Ambrose of Milan 179 - 180 | |
| Ammianus Marcellinus 57 - 009 - 122 - 167 - 171 - 176 - 180 | Baal 189 |
| Anonymous writer of the 12th century 58 - 104 - 109 | Balīnās 77 - 112 - 113 - 120 - 121 - 182 |
| Antiochus of Aegaeae 22 - 31 - 36 - 47 - 52 - 68 - 72/75 - 78 - 85 - 108 - 109 - 113 - 117 - 119 - 122 - 123 - 157 | Bar Hebraeus 118 |
| Anastasius Sinaita 75 - 107 | Basil of Macedon 108 - 109 |
| Aphrodite 158 - 160 | Basil of Seleucia 71 - 108 |
| Apollo 57 - 65 - 66 - 69 - 70 - 119 | |
| Apollonius of Tyana, passim 9/16; 19/114; 116/119; 121/126; 129/151; 153/157; 159/165; 170/182; 185/191; 193/212 | Caesar 75 - 76 |
| Apuleius 92 - 98 - 107 - 169 - 179 | Caligula 36 |
| Arbogast 168 | Callirhoe 24 |
| Archelaus 34 - 35 | Caracalla 31 - 32 - 56 - 59 - 60 - 64 - 91 |
| Ares 76 | Casperius Aelianus 23 |
| | Cassius Dio 27 - 29/32 - 34/36 - 41 - 44 - 51 - 56 - 59 - 89 - 91 - 92 - 177 - 185 - 189 |

- Cedrenos 75 - 77 - 103 - 108
 - 109 - 117 - 125
 Celsus 45 - 87 - 88 - 96 - 153
 Chaereas 24
 Chaeremon 139
 Chariton 24
 Chilon 163 - 182
 Chiron 54 - 81 - 115 - 163
 Christ 15 - 98 - 101 - 102 - 106
 - 111 - 124 - 137 - 154/156 -
 160 - 162 - 164 - 171 - 174
 - 178/180 - 187 - 193 - 195
 - 196 - 201/205 - 210
 Cicero 169 - 174
 Claudius 32 - 36 - 109 - 111 -
 118 - 125
 Constantine the Great 58 - 125
 - 158 - 160 - 167
 Constantius 167
 Cosmas of Jerusalem 111
 Cronius 139
 Croton 133
 Cyril of Alexandria 165
 Damis 12 - 19 - 20 - 24/29 - 41
 - 49 - 136 - 141 - 150 - 156
 - 190 - 209 - 210
 Damianus, see Flavius Damianus
 Dares Phrygius 26
 Debborius 76
 Demetrius 21/23 - 26 - 27 - 41
 - 44 - 48 - 49
 Diagoras 165
 Dictynna 66
 Dictys Cretensis 26 - 27
 Dinaeus 108
 Dio Chrysostom of Prusa 11 -
 22 - 37 - 41/44 - 48 - 49 -
 55 - 60 - 61 - 75 - 148
 Diocletian 15 - 97 - 153 - 157
 Dionysus 82 - 147
 Domitian 20 - 22/24 - 30 - 32
 - 33 - 34 - 36/42 - 44 - 48
 - 49 - 54 - 55 - 75/77 - 80
 - 83 - 98 - 101 - 107/111 -
 125 - 130 - 155 - 178 - 185
 Epictetus 60 - 61
 Eugenius, Flavius 153 - 168 -
 169
 Eunapius of Sardis 67 - 163
 Eusebius of Caesarea 28 - 36 -
 68 - 99/103 - 106 - 124 -
 136/139 - 147/150 - 154/160
 - 164 - 171 - 179 - 194/198
 Euphrates 22 - 26 - 37 - 41 -
 43/49 - 63 - 69 - 78/83 - 88/90
 - 99 - 118 - 134 - 150 - 151
 - 185 - 190
 Falvius Damianus 28 - 31 - 191
 Flavius Sabinus 44
 Flavius Vopiscus 175 - 176
 Galba 22
 Galerius 157
 Garmos 24
 Glycon 86
 Gorgias 163
 Gratian 168
 Gregory Cedrenos 36 - 107
 Gregory Monachos 108
 Gregory Syncellos 111
 Hadrian 46 - 48 - 54 - 80 - 81
 - 130
 Heliodorus 95

- Hercules Apotropaius 79
 Hermes Trismegistos 60 - 94 - 115 - 118/120 - 122 - 127 - 163
 Hestiaeus 60 - 67
 Hesychios of Miletus 108 - 111
 Hierocles 15 - 28 - 98/101 - 103 - 123 - 124 - 138 - 148 - 153/157 - 161 - 163 - 171 - 187 - 193 - 195 - 196 - 198 - 200
 Honorius 168
 Iamblichus, littérateur 24 - 131/133
 Iamblichus, philosopher 131
 Iarchas 29
 Isidorus of Pelusium 102 - 164
 Isocrates 102 - 163
 Jerome 36 - 37 - 98 - 177 - 178 - 180
 Jonah 79 - 108 - 179
 John Chrysostom 75 - 83 - 164 - 165
 John Malalas 36 - 75 - 77
 John Tzetzes 31 - 58 - 109
 Joseph 27
 Jove 179
 Julia Domna 14 - 19 - 27 - 31 - 35 - 53 - 74 - 161 - 188 - 190/192
 Julian the Apostate 158/163 - 167 - 168
 Julianus 107 - 111 - 165
 Lactantius 79 - 101 - 124 - 154/156 - 164 - 179
 Leo 170 - 180
 Libanius 163 - 165
 Livy 169 - 170
 Lucian 38 - 60 - 86/93 - 129 - 134 - 189
 Macarios Magnes 97 - 98
 Macrobius 166 - 169
 Maximinus Daia 157
 Maximus 30
 Maximus of Aegaeae 34 - 35 - 54 - 62/64 - 70/73 - 82 - 85 - 88 - 135 - 143 - 146 - 150 - 155 - 156 - 181 - 190
 Malalas 76 - 77 - 107/109 - 111 - 117 - 125
 Mamūn 120
 Marcellus 179
 Marcus Aurelius 48 - 60 - 61 - 64 - 148
 Marcus Cocceius Nerva, see Nerva
 Marinus 121
 Marius 119
 Michael Glycas 111
 Michael Syrus 118
 Moderatus of Gades 133 - 140
 Moiragenes 44/46 - 48 - 49 - 79 - 80 - 82 - 85 - 88 - 90 - 91 - 96 - 97 - 123 - 124 - 143 - 181 - 190
 Moses 119 - 163
 Musonius Rufus 21 - 27 - 41 - 44 - 48 - 49 - 163
 Neilos of Ancyra 108
 Nemesius of Emesa 120 - 121
 Nero 20/23 - 25 - 27 - 36 - 125

- Nerva 12 - 23 - 39 - 48 - 49
 - 111
 Niceforos Callistos 110
 Nicetas Choniates 110
 Nicolas 182
 Nicomachus Flavianus, Virius
 153 - 154 - 161 - 165 - 166
 - 168/172 - 174/177 - 180 -
 181 - 188 - 190
 Nichomachus of Gerasa 94 - 131
 - 133 - 139 - 140 - 174 - 190
 Numa Pompilius 119
 Numenius of Apameia 94 - 134
 - 139 - 140 - 190

 Octavian 119
 Origen 87 - 96 - 97
 Orpheus 90 - 174
 Othon 22

 Parthenius 30
 Paul, the Apostle 75 - 80 - 83
 - 155 - 164
 Peter, the Apostle 155 - 167
 Philip of Macedon 108
 Philolaos of Kitton 21
 Philostratus II of Lemnos, pas-
 sim 9/16 - 19 - 20 - 22 - 23/46
 - 48 - 49 - 51/59 - 61/63 - 66
 - 67 - 70/75 - 77/80 - 82 - 83
 - 85 - 88 - 91/98 - 103 - 111
 - 113 - 121/124 - 129/138 -
 141/143 - 145/151 - 153/157
 - 160 - 161 - 163 - 164 - 170
 - 171 - 175 - 177 - 178 - 180
 - 182 - 185/191 - 194/198 -
 200 - 210

 Photius 100
 Phraotes 29 - 142
 Plato 90 - 92 - 106 - 143 - 163
 - 176 - 182
 Plantianus 59
 Pliny the Younger 47 - 106 - 163
 - 176 - 182
 Plotinus 119 - 139
 Plutarch 48 - 81 - 163 - 182
 Pompeius Julianus 47
 Porphyry 51 - 52 - 96/99 - 101
 - 131/133 - 136/139 - 150 -
 153 - 155 - 163 - 178 - 179
 - 187
 Praetextatus 165 - 169 - 170
 Proclus 121
 Proteus 66 - 121 - 161
 Pseudo-Gregory Codinos 110 -
 125
 Pseudo-Justin 74 - 75 - 101 - 102
 - 104/106 - 116 - 118 - 122
 - 124/126 - 135 - 162
 Pseudo-Nonius 111 - 112
 Pythagoras 27 - 28 - 41 - 46 -
 63 - 70 - 72 - 83 - 86 - 90
 - 92 - 94 - 100 - 106 - 119
 - 130/134 - 139 - 142
 Pythais 70

 Saggiūs 120 - 121
 Sallustius 169
 Salvidienus Orphitus 23
 Scipio Africanus 119
 Scopelianus 20 - 26 - 37 - 41
 - 42 - 55
 Seneca 48 - 60 - 61
 Septimius Severus 14 - 32 - 59
 - 188 - 190 - 202

- Severus Alexander 9 - 15 - 58
 - 85 - 96 - 99 - 174 - 182
 Sidonius Apollinaris 153 - 170
 - 171 - 180 - 181 - 182 - 188
 - 203
 Socrates 21 - 90 - 119 - 165
 Solon 163 - 182
 Sophocles 163
 Sossianus Hierocles 15 - 98 - 99
 - 101 - 153 - 154 - 187 - 193
 Soterichos of Oasis 97 - 181
 Sozomenos 158
 Statilius Crito 63
 Stephanus 30
 Suetonius 27
 Sustomos or Dustomos Thallas-
 sos 104 - 114 - 116
 Symmachus, Quintus Aurelius
 104 - 165/167 - 169/171 - 174
 - 177
 Synesius of Cyrene 164/167 -
 169

 Tacitus 27 - 169
 Tascius Victorianus 170 - 171 -
 180
 Telesinus 21
 Teon 114 - 116
 Themistius 163 - 170
 Theodoret of Cyrus 74
 Theodosius the Great 153 - 168
 - 169
 Thucydides 163 - 182 - 183
 Tiberius 34 - 36 - 46 - 48
 Tigellinus 11 - 21
 Titus 20 - 22 - 39 - 49
 Trajan 48 - 63
 Trophonius 46 - 122 - 130
 Tyndares 81
 Tzetzes 59 - 68 - 77 - 111

 Valentinian II 168
 Valerius Asiaticus 33 - 34 - 37
 - 63 - 144
 Valerius Festes, C. Calpetanus
 Rantius Quirinalis 33 - 39
 Vardanes 20 - 27 - 49
 Vergil 169
 Verginius Rufus 23
 Vespasian 20 - 22 - 27 - 38 -
 39 - 43 - 48 - 49
 Vettius Agorius Pratextatus, see
 Praetextatus
 Vicoty 166 - 167 - 169 - 168
 Vindex 22
 Vitellius 22

 Zeno 165
 Zeus 57 - 66
 Zeus Asbameus 57
 Zonaras 30 - 31 - 158 - 159
 Zoroaster 90 - 94 - 95 - 101
 Zosimos 115

Finito di stampare in Roma
nel mese di settembre 1986 per conto de
«L'ERMA» di Bretschneider
dalla Tipo-Lito Aurelia 72 - Via L. Calamatta, 29/a